PROTO-LUKE RECONSIDERED: A STUDY OF LITERARY METHOD AND THEOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

by

Allen Freeman Page

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: May 29, 1968

Approved:

D. Moody Smith, Jr.
D. Moody Smith, Jr., Supervisor

W. D. Davies

W. F. Stinespring

J. N. Truesdale

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Department of Religion
in the Graduate School of Arts and
Sciences of Duke University

1968

ABSTRACT

(Religion)

PROTO-LUKE RECONSIDERED: A STUDY OF LITERARY METHOD AND THEOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

by

Allen F. Page

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: May 29, 1968

Approved:

D. Moody Smith, Jr.
D. Moody Smith, Jr., Supervisor

W. D. Davies

W. F. Stinespring

J. N. Truesdale

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
Religion in the Graduate School of Arts
and Sciences of Duke University

1968

Tr.R.
Ph.D.
P132P
1968

PROTO-LUKE RECONSIDERED: A STUDY OF LITERARY METHOD AND THEOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Allen F. Page

The purpose of this study is to re-examine the Proto-Luke hypothesis. The hypothesis was suggested by Burnett Hillman Streeter and given its classic defence by Vincent Taylor. Streeter and Taylor have proposed that the non-Marcan portions of the Gospel of Luke originally comprised a "gospel-like" document which was later expanded by the insertion of Marcan material. Although this hypothesis of the literary origin of the Third Gospel has never gained general acceptance, it has been received by some with enthusiasm. Many Gospel critics, however, have proceeded without giving the Proto-Luke hypothesis serious consideration. With the advent of Redaktionsgeschichte (redaction criticism) as a methodology for working with the Gospel, firm conclusions concerning the basic problem of sources in the Gospels have been assumed. Those who have employed the redaktionsgeschichtliche method in working with the Gospel of Luke have assumed that Mark provides the Grundschrift for the Third Gospel. The Proto-Luke hypothesis calls this assumption into question. If the Proto-Luke hypothesis were to be accepted, it would greatly affect the outcome of the redaktionsgeschichtliche analysis of the

Gospel of Luke. It is necessary, therefore, that the Proto-Luke hypothesis be thoroughly reconsidered.

The first major portion of this study (chapter II) is devoted to an analysis of the sections of Luke attributed to Proto-Luke. Three paradigmatic questions have been asked in the analysis of these sections: (1) What right have these sections to be called "non-Marcan"? (2) What are the narrative episodes? (3) What is the source of the narrative framework? This analysis indicates that the amount of Marcan material in the sections attributed to Proto-Luke has been underestimated by the advocates of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Furthermore, there is little evidence of a framework in the sections attributed to Proto-Luke other than the framework which may also be seen in Mark.

In the second section of the dissertation the alternative view that Mark provides the Grundschrift for Luke is proposed. The Third Gospel is pictured as a well planned and carefully executed literary unit in which Marcan and non-Marcan materials are closely interwoven. Motifs, emphases, and theological interests which are characteristic of Luke-Acts have been seen to play an important role in the way Luke has combined Marcan and non-Marcan materials. Indeed, the changes which the Third Evangelist has made in Mark can better be accounted for by the view that while using Mark as his Grundschrift he has been free to add, delete, and alter his materials in order to bring out his own interests than, by the Proto-Luke hypothesis. The view that Mark provides the Grund-

schrift of the Third Gospel, when combined with an understanding of Luke as author and theologian, accounts for most of the phenomena of the literary structure of the Third Gospel as we now have it. The Proto-Luke hypothesis is unnecessary.

PREFACE

This study of the Proto-Luke hypothesis was begun as an analysis of the Lucan Passion narrative. As I worked with the Passion narrative I gradually began to recognize the need for a thorough examination of the way Luke has used his sources not only there, but throughout the Gospel. In this study I have attempted to focus upon the literary method and the theology of the Gospel of Luke. Primary attention has been devoted to the study of the Greek text of the Third Gospel itself. Quotations from the New Testament are in Greek. References made in the course of this work frequently necessitate familiarity with the context within the Gospel of Luke. The dissertation, therefore, needs to be read with the Greek New Testament near at hand for constant reference.

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. D. Moody Smith, Jr., who as friend and supervisor has provided guidance throughout my work on this project. I also wish to thank the other members of my guidance committee, which has included, at one time or another, Professors William F. Stinespring, W. D. Davies, James L. Price, Jr., Kenneth W. Clark, Hugh Anderson, Robert S. Rogers, and James N. Truesdale. To Dean Robert E. Cushman and the Duke Divinity School I wish to express my gratitude for the opportunity of teaching Hellenistic Greek during my four years of study in the graduate program in religion. I

am appreciative of the work of my typists, Miss Ruby Bailey, Mrs. Pauline Anglin, and Mrs. Joyce Farris. Most especially I am grateful to my wife, Sally Rigsbee Page, for her companionship and support while we have both been in graduate school and to my daughter Ellen, of whom I have seen too little while completing this dissertation.

A. F. P.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

PREFACE vi

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ix

I. INTRODUCTION 2

II. AN ANALYSIS OF THE SECTIONS ATTRIBUTED TO PROTO-LUKE . . . 36

Luke 3:1-4:30 37
Luke 5:1-11 53
Luke 6:12-8:3 57
Luke 9:51-18:14 66
Luke 19:1-27 97
Luke 19:37-44, 47-48 100
Luke 21:18, 34-36 105
Luke 22:14-24:53 105

III. AN ALTERNATIVE TO PROTO-LUKE 146

Luke 1-2 148
Luke 3:1-4:30 155
Luke 4:31-9:50 168
Luke 9:51-19:27 190
Luke 19:28-24:53 215

IV. CONCLUSION 239

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 262

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Exp. *T*.	*Expository Times*
H. *T*. *R*.	*Harvard Theological Review*
J. *B*. *L*.	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
J. *T*. *S*.	*Journal of Theological Studies*
N. *T*.	*Novum Testamentum*
N. *T*. *S*.	*New Testament Studies*
R. *Exp*.	*Review and Expositor*
S. *S*. *P*.	William Sanday, editor, *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*.
Z. *N*. *W*.	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

PROTO-LUKE RECONSIDERED: A STUDY OF LITERARY METHOD AND THEOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Since 1950 there has been a marked increase in the study of Luke-Acts. Whereas at the middle of our century the study of the Fourth Gospel claimed primary attention among New Testament scholars,[1] attention is presently focused in much the same way on the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. C. K. Barrett has asserted:

> It would not be far wrong to say that the focus of New Testament studies is now moving to the Lucan writings. The Fourth Gospel raised, in one form, the problem which is always pressed upon the Christian thinker by the nature of his subject, namely, that of the relation between history and theology. It is the same ultimate problem that the

---

[1] Indeed, in 1936, C. H. Dodd did make such a statement with reference to the place of the importance of the study of the Fourth Gospel among New Testament scholars. See The Present Task in New Testament Studies (Cambridge: University Press, 1936), p. 29.

> Lucan writings raise, though they raise it in a different way.[1]

W. C. van Unnik has made much the same observation in his essay "Luke-Acts, A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship."[2] Van Unnik states:

> The editors chose the subject [studies in Luke-Acts] not only because they knew of the special predeliction which their teacher and friend, Dr. Schubert, has for the problems involved and to which he himself has devoted much of his scholarly interest, but also because they were quite well aware that at the present moment Luke-Acts holds a key position in the New Testament field, far more than it did a generation ago. Of course, for its subject matter and length this two-volume work has never been neglected . . . . And yet in 1950 no one could have foretold that in the next decade Luke-Acts would become one of the great storm centers of New Testament scholarship, second only to that of the "historical Jesus."[3]

If one work were to be singled out as a turning point in the rise of interest in Luke, it would have to be Hans Conzelmann's _The Theology of St. Luke_.[4] Conzelmann's work has probably more widely affected the current trend of interpretation of the Lucan writings than any other single publication. This is likely more the case in America and England than in Germany, for in this country Conzelmann has become both the interpreter of a movement in Germany and the representative of a widely accepted view of Luke as a theologian. This view of Luke as a theologian has replaced in most circles the previously dominant understanding of Luke as one whose interest was more historical than theological.[1] With this changing view of Luke, emphasis has been placed on the Third Evangelist as author and theologian. His own creative role has been emphasized, often at the expense of acknowledging his debt to the tradition which he inherited. There has been an increasing tendency to follow the trend which had already begun under the influence of form criticism--namely, the trend to abandon the search for sources to which so much attention was given in earlier decades. Says Barrett:

---

[1] C. K. Barrett, _Luke the Historian in Recent Study_ (London: Epworth Press, 1961), p. 50.

[2] W. C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts, A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," _Studies in Luke-Acts_, edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (New York: Abingdon, 1966), pp. 15-32.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 15.

[4] Hans Conzelmann, _The Theology of St. Luke_, translated by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Row, 1960).

Originally published in Germany as Die Mitte der Zeit (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953). Hereafter cited as Conzelmann.

[1] The view of St. Luke as an historian is thoroughly documented by Andrew J. Mattill in "Luke as a Historian in Criticism since 1840" (an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1959).

> They have abandoned the old search for literary sources, and think of Luke as an author, handling some literary material, perhaps, but himself responsible for collecting, digesting, and setting out information drawn from traditional and other sources.[1]

It is indeed ironic that the search for literary sources in Luke-Acts (and elsewhere within the New Testament as well) should be abandoned just at the time when the *redaktionsgeschichtliche* approach to the Gospel is becoming a widely accepted methodology. This approach to studying the Gospels attempts to isolate the work of the evangelist as a redactor whose theological interests can be seen by the manner in which he has approached his work.[2] A working assumption of *Redaktionsgeschichte* is that it is possible to delineate the sources used by the evangelist, for only by first separating the sources used by the evangelist is it possible then to determine what additions or redactions have been made by him.

---

[1] Barrett, *Luke the Historian*, p. 51.

[2] The *redaktionsgeschichtliche* method is well demonstrated in the work of Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*; Willi Marxen, *Der Evangelist Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956); and Günter Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, translated by Percy Scott (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963).

Recent studies of the speeches in Acts have indicated that they do not embody only the traditional materials which might reflect apostolic preaching.[1] Rather the speeches seem to be Lucan formulations and to reflect primarily the Christological teachings of his own day.[2] However, there remain also some vestiges of primitive Christological affirmations. These two levels must be separated if we are to understand Luke as a theologian.

The same is true in the Third Gospel. We must attempt to distinguish between the work of the Third Evangelist and his sources. Where he is using Mark as a source, it may be relatively easy to determine his hand at work as a redactor. However, where Mark is not his source, the task is much more difficult, if not impossible. Detailed analysis of Luke's sources and his use of them is essential. Indeed, it is unfortunate that the search for sources has been abandoned by many who seek to apply the redaktionsgeschichteliche methodology to the Third Gospel.

---

[1] For the view that they did, see C. H. Dodd, Apostolic Preaching and Its Development (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1936).

[2] Ulrich Wilckens, Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Bd. 5, edited by Günter Bornkamm and Gerhard von Rad (Neukirchener Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961). See also Donald Lee Jones, "The Christology of the Missionary Speeches in The Acts of the Apostles" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1966).

We can only assume that those whose work is dependent upon an analysis of the sources of the Third Gospel and yet have abandoned the search for sources feel that the question of sources in the Gospel of Luke has been solved. But is this the case? Luke's use of Mark as the Grundschrift for the Third Gospel has been widely assumed. This may be the most adequate explanation of Luke's use of sources. On the other hand, more thorough consideration must be given to another widely suggested solution to the problem of sources in Luke--namely, the Proto-Luke hypothesis as put forth by B. H. Streeter[1] and defended by Vincent Taylor.[2]

The Proto-Luke hypothesis was suggested by Streeter in the late stages of a search for a solution to the synoptic problem which goes back far into the history of the interpretation of the Gospels. Many solutions have been proposed at various times. However, during the nineteenth century research in Gospel criticism gradually led to a consensus that Mark was prior to either Matthew or Luke. William Farmer has pointed to Heinrich Holtzmann as the first to synthesize the findings of synoptic research so as to establish this conclusion as a point on which there was general agreement.[1] The synthesis of Holtzmann became a working principle in German circles of Gospel criticism and has largely remained such for the past century. Once this synthesis was established and accepted in German schools of synoptic research, there was little need for further discussion on the matter. Concern for the issue of the priority of Mark has, however, continued to be a matter of concern in English circles of Gospel criticism.

---

[1] B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (London: Macmillan and Company, 1924) and "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem," Hibbert Journal, XX (1920), 103-111. Hereafter, The Four Gospels will be referred to as Streeter, with a citation of the page reference.

[2] Vincent Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926). Hereafter cited as Taylor, with a citation of the page reference.

A most influential figure in the transmission of the Holtzmannian synthesis of the two-document hypothesis from Germany to England was William Sanday. He cited the work of Holtzmann, saying--

---

[1] William R. Farmer, The Synoptic Problem (New York: Macmillan Company, 1964), pp. 36 ff. This work by Farmer, despite the manner in which he consistently propounds his own thesis, provides one of the most valuable summaries of the history of the synoptic problem which is available. See also the work of Heinrich J. Holtzmann, Die Synoptischen Evangelium (Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863).

> It should be remembered that Dr. Holtzmann does not stand alone, but that for the greater portion of his results (e.g. as to the documentary origin of the Synoptic Gospels, the priority of St. Mark, the existence of two main documents and the independent use of them by the Evangelists) he has the support of a majority of the best critics during the last ten or fifteen years, including among these Weizsacker, Meyer, Ritschl, Weiss, Wittischen, and practically also the veteran Ewald. These conclusions I accept temporarily, but I hope to be able to approach the subject myself with sufficient independence.[1]

Sanday did pursue his work on the synoptic problem, and in 1894 he began his famous Oxford seminar on the synoptic problem, out of which came the essays which were published in the volume Studies in the Synoptic Problem.[2]

Supporters of Sanday and his co-workers in the task of transmitting the conclusions of the German school to England included F. H. Woods, F. C. Burkitt, and John C. Hawkins. The primary contribution of Woods was the setting forth for the English reader of a detailed argument for the priority of Mark, presenting evidence of the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke on the basis of content, general form, and order of their Gospels.[1] Burkitt accepted the priority of Mark as propounded by Woods and others and argued strongly that there was no need to postulate an *Ur-Markus*, as had been proposed in German circles.[2] Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae* gave detailed linguistic support to the theory very generally held by this time that a source corresponding on the whole with our present Gospel of Mark was used by the other two synoptists as a basis or *Grundschrift*.[3] The work of these men, together with that of Sanday, provides the background for the conclusions stated in the *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. In these essays there is evidence of a growing consensus of the priority of Mark and the two-document hypothesis. We should note, however, that there was not unanimity of scholarly opinion on this point.[1] There is also evidence of an awareness that not all the problems had been eliminated from the two-document hypothesis and the assumption of the priority of Mark. Cognizance of these problems was expressed particularly in the essays by John C. Hawkins[2] and B. H. Streeter.[3] Nevertheless, there is underlying the work produced by the Oxford seminar an agreement, despite these differences, which is obvious to one who studies carefully these essays.

---

[1] William Sanday, The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel Considered in Reference to the Contents of the Gospel Itself (London: Macmillan Company, 1872), p. ix.

[2] William Sanday (ed.), Studies in the Synoptic Problem (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911). Hereafter cited as S. S. P. This volume has essays by Sanday, John C. Hawkins, B. H. Streeter, W. C. Allen, J. Vernon Bartlet, W. E. Addis, and N. P. Williams.

---

[1] F. H. Woods, "The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels," *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, Essays Chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism by Members of the University of Oxford*, vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890), pp. 59-104.

[2] F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), pp. 33-64. As an example of the case for *Ur-Markus* see E. Wendling, *Ur-Markus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1905).

[3] John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), p. 114.

It remained for B. H. Streeter, the protegé of Sanday, to give fullest expression to this agreement. In his classic work, _The Four Gospels_,[4] Streeter set forth the major conclusions of synoptic research in what is perhaps the most thorough discussion of the synoptic problem in the English language. Streeter's detailed analysis of the issues involved undergirded his assertion of these conclusions in such a manner that his work remains a classic which should be consulted by serious students of the synoptic problem. At least for the English speaking world, Streeter's magnum opus provided a milestone in Gospel criticism. With his work more than with any other one work, the conclusions of the priority of Mark and the existence of another document which was used, along with Mark by Matthew and Luke came to be accepted as sound conclusions. Since Streeter's time these conclusions have continued to be widely accepted. These points of the work of Streeter were representative of many New Testament scholars. In formulating these conclusions Streeter was giving expression to a consensus which had not been expressed previously.[1]

---

[1] The essay by J. Vernon Bartlet, "The Sources of St. Luke's Gospel," _S. S. P._, pp. 312-366, is given as a minority report.

[2] Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of Mark," _S. S. P._, pp. 27-94.

[3] Streeter, "On the Original Order of Q," _S. S. P_, pp. 141-164, and "St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q," _S. S. P._, pp. 165-184.

[4] Streeter, _The Four Gospels_.

---

[1] This is not to say, however, that the conclusions expressed by Streeter have gone unchallenged. In his day, Streeter's views were opposed by several scholars who did not accept the priority of Mark. Even before Streeter published The Four Gospels his views were attacked by E. W. Lummis, How Luke Was Written (Cambridge: University Press, 1915). Lummis argued, among other things, for the priority of Matthew. Also before the publication of The Four Gospels, Streeter's basic arguments for the priority of Mark were attacked by H. G. Jameson in The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1922). Jameson was greatly impressed by the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. The view of Jameson and Lummis has remained a distinctly minority view since the time of Streeter, especially in Protestant synoptic criticism. The priority of Matthew has been asserted in a serious manner by some, but not all, Roman Catholic scholars. See, for example, the work of B. C. Butler, The Originality

In his expression of concensus on some of the conclusions of synoptic research, Streeter rendered a great service to New Testament research. He was not, however, content to stop with an expression of the consensus of his day. He pushed on to assert other hypotheses of his own which have had great effect on the discussion of the synoptic problem since 1920. Streeter went beyond the two-document hypothesis to propose a four-document hypothesis as his fundamental solution to the synoptic problem. For him, not only was Mark the earliest Gospel which was used by Matthew and Luke along with a second document common to the two of them (Q), but also the First and Third Evangelists had a further document which was not known to the other. In this manner Streeter accounted for the material peculiar to both Matthew and Luke.[1] Furthermore, Streeter proposed that the material which the Third Evangelist held in common with Matthew (Q) and the material peculiar to Luke (L) were combined by Luke to form a gospel-like document before Luke became

---

of St. Matthew (Cambridge: University Press, 1951). Foremost among the recent Protestant attempts to revive the view that Matthew is prior to Mark is the work of William Farmer.

[1] Streeter, _The Four Gospels_, chapter IX, "A Four Document Hypothesis," pp. 223-270.

acquainted with Mark. Streeter called this document Proto-Luke. Only later was Q-L, or Proto-Luke, combined with Mark to form the Gospel of Luke as we have it.[1] This Proto-Luke hypothesis is of utmost significance among the assertions of Streeter. And although this hypothesis in no way represented a consensus of those for whom Streeter spoke on many issues, the Proto-Luke hypothesis was received with interest by many scholars. This is as it should have been, for Streeter's hypothesis had important implications in the modification of the expressed consensus of the priority of Mark. While Streeter in no way qualified the assumption that Mark was the first Gospel, the import of the priority of Mark was drastically changed; for prior to Streeter the assertion of the priority of Mark was generally accompanied by the assertion that Mark provided the Grundschrift for both Matthew and Luke. The Proto-Luke hypothesis, however, denies that Mark provides the Grundschrift for Luke. Instead, the Proto-Luke hypothesis assumes that the Third Gospel has as its Grundschrift an expanded Q, a Q enlarged by the insertion of the material peculiar to the Gospel of Luke.

---

[1] Streeter first gave expression to the Proto-Luke hypothesis in an article in the Hibbert Journal, XX (1920), 103-111, entitled "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem." His argument from this article was later incorporated in The Four Gospels, chapter VIII, "Proto-Luke," pp. 199-222, in much the same form.

In both his article in the Hibbert Journal in 1920 and in The Four Gospels, Streeter set forth the Proto-Luke hypothesis in almost capsule form. In so doing he also indicated the need for further work to test or to substantiate the hypothesis. Streeter himself, however, did little to accomplish this task. Rather this task remained for Vincent Taylor, who in a most thorough manner defined and undergirded the Proto-Luke hypothesis by his investigation of the matter. Results of his detailed analysis are found in his book, Behind the Third Gospel,[1] and in an article, "The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel."[2]

Shortly after the publication of the classic presentation of the Proto-Luke hypothesis by Taylor, numerous scholars attacked the Proto-Luke hypothesis. In 1927, H. J. Cadbury rejected the idea that Luke was dependent on a source parallel to Mark for the framework of the Third Gospel. Rather, said Cadbury, Luke used Mark with some degree of freedom even when he varied considerably from Mark.[1] In the same year J. W. Hunkin also pointed to the freedom exercised by the Third Evangelist in his use of Mark.[2] Hunkin noted that Luke followed the Markan order. Furthermore, the narrative elements peculiar to Luke may not come from Q or L.[3] Luke may have used more editorial freedom than Taylor has allowed. When these facts are taken into consideration, it is too much to claim with Taylor that Proto-Luke gives a source for the life of Jesus comparable to Mark or Q. The most than can be conceded, said Hunkin, is the possible existence of a Q+L document as a "collection of discourse and anecdote."[4] Proto-Luke as a "gospel-like" document is, therefore, an unwarranted and unnecessary postulation.

---

[1] Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel.

[2] Taylor, "The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel," Theology, XIV (1927), 131-164. See the bibliography for additional writings by Taylor which support the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

A third work which appeared in 1927 attacking the Proto-Luke hypothesis is that of W. Lockton, Certain Alleged

---

[1] H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (New York: Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 96.

[2] J. W. Hunkin, "The Composition of the Third Gospel, with Special Reference to Canon Streeter's Theory of Proto-Luke," JTS, XXVIII (1927), 251.

[3] The question of where there are narrative elements native to the Q and L material is a question which Hunkin felt must remain uncertain. Ibid., p. 258. This is, however, a matter which has received too little attention and to which we shall give attention in this study.

[4] Ibid.

Gospel Sources: A Study of Q, Proto-Luke and M.[1] Lockton's major criticism of the Proto-Luke hypothesis lies in the fact that, as he says,

> Neither Dr. Streeter nor Dr. Taylor makes any real attempt to supply a proof of the hypothesis by dealing with alternative explanations of the phenomena, but each is content to regard as sufficient in the way of proof the fact that the evidence on inquiry is found not to be entirely contradictory, though various difficulties are candidly admitted and left unexplained.[2]

By Taylor's own admission Lockton's criticism is a very important one. At the same time, Lockton's attack on the Proto-Luke hypothesis made little impact. The reason for this appears to lie in the unpopular alternative explanation of the phenomena which he had to offer. In a chapter entitled "Mark and the Johannine Tradition,"[3] he cited several passages in Mark which he thought to be best explained as combinations of Luke and John. Thus, Lockton would make Mark the last of the canonical Gospels. The difficulty of separating his criticism of the Proto-Luke hypothesis from this latter assertion caused his work to go almost unnoticed.

---

[1] W. Lockton, Certain Alleged Gospel Sources: A Study of Q, Proto-Luke and M (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1927). Taylor has called Lockton one of two very important critics of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Taylor says, "the supporters of the hypothesis have set out in great detail the arguments upon which it rests, but their opponents, with the honorable exceptions of W. Lockton and J. M. Creed, content themselves with vague expressions of dissent."--"After Fifty Years: I. The Gospel and the Gospels," Exp. T., L (1939), 8.

[2] Lockton, p. 3.

[3] Ibid., pp. 24-35.

Still, in 1927, C. G. Montefiore registered his strong reservation with reference to the Proto-Luke hypothesis. In the revised introduction to his The Synoptic Gospels, he questioned the assumption that all the materials apart from Mark and Q go back to a common source which has the homogeneity which Taylor and Streeter ascribe to Proto-Luke. Montefiore preferred to see Luke as using several sources in addition to Mark in the writing of the Third Gospel.[1]

There was also support for the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Among the more important supporters of Proto-Luke in terms of his efforts to popularize the hypothesis was E. Basil Redlich. Redlich was one of the first to lend support to Proto-Luke in an introductory work on the Synoptic Gospels. He devoted seventeen pages to setting forth the salient points of the hypothesis.[2] Eric F. F. Bishop provided less significant support for the hypothesis with his argument that elements of

---

1. C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (2nd edition; London: Macmillan and Company, 1927), I, xciii ff.

2. E. Basil Redlich, The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1936), pp. 92-109.

local color are more concentrated in the sections of the Third Gospel which Streeter and Taylor attributed to Proto-Luke.[1]

As indicated above, many of the criticisms of the position of Streeter and Taylor were vague expressions of dissent,[2] as have been many expressions of support. There have been, however, several responses to the Proto-Luke hypothesis which have been more precise in their criticisms. One such is exemplified by the work of Maurice Goguel.[3] Goguel's own study of the Third Gospel led him to the conclusion that "Luke's narrative is a literary elaboration of that of Mark, supplemented by certain fragmentary traditions."[4] As was the case with Lockton, Goguel's attack on the Proto-Luke hypothesis was coupled with other conclusions which have caused his response to the Proto-Luke hypothesis to go largely unnoticed and unappreciated. Goguel's conclusions are, however, much different from those of Lockton. His alternative explanation of the phenomena was that while most of the differences between Mark and Luke may be accounted for by supplementation from fragmentary tradition, some of the differences between Matthew and Luke must be accounted for by the existence of two forms of the Gospel of Mark. Luke used the more primitive form, whereas Matthew used the same form of Mark which has come down to us.[1]

---

[1] Eric F. F. Bishop, "Local Color in Proto-Luke," Exp. T., XLV (1933-34), 151-56.

[2] See above, pp. 16-17, and n. 1, p. 17.

[3] Maurice Goguel, "Luke and Mark: With a Discussion of Streeter's Theory," HTR, XXVI (1933), 1-55. Taylor does not refer to this work of Goguel in his citation of Lockton and Creed as exceptional critics of the Proto-Luke hypothesis who have gone beyond "value expressions of dissent." See p. 17, n. 1. The article by Goguel is, in the opinion of this writer, one of several significant criticisms of the position of Streeter and Taylor.

[4] Goguel, p. 38.

Probably the most influential criticisms of the Proto-Luke hypothesis have been those by J. M. Creed.[2] As we have already had occasion to observe, the impact of Creed's criticisms is readily admitted by Taylor.[3] Creed emphasized the role of Luke as a creative artist in the composition of the Third Gospel and stressed that the Gospel of Luke is a work of self-conscious art.[1] Creed attempted to demonstrate the creative work of the Third Evangelist whom he believed to have been working with Mark as his fundamental source. The criticisms of Creed are impressive on their own grounds. However, they become all the more convincing when we recognize the concessions which Creed allowed in the direction of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. He acknowledged that Luke may have had at his disposal some non-Marcan narrative material and parables peculiar to him.[2] He even conceded the possibility that these materials may have been brought together in some form prior to the existence of Luke as we know it. He says,

---

[1] Goguel, p. 52. Of the form of Mark used by Luke, Goguel: "The earlier form did not contain the Bethany cycle (division into days, fig trees, annointing) and in the Synoptic apocalypse it referred to the seige of Jerusalem instead of the abomination of desolation as the sign of the end."

[2] J. M. Creed, "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems. II. 'L' and the Structure of the Lucan Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Exp. T.*, XCVI (1934), 101-107, and *The Gospel According to Luke* (London: Macmillan and Company, 1930).

[3] See above, p. 17, n. 1.

> If the 'Proto-Luke hypothesis' is merely used as a phrase to cover the very common theory that Q, as Luke knew it, was already combined with some of the material peculiar to Luke, I am not at all concerned to dispute it. This hypothesis undoubtedly gives a good explanation of why Luke, in the body of his Gospel, puts narratives which he probably regarded as doublets of Marcan narratives in a non-Marcan setting. There are also other points in its favor; and I think it may well be true. But when Dr. Taylor, for instance, speaks of Proto-Luke, he generally--though not quite always--means the much more comprehensive theory which he shares with Canon Streeter, that Q incorporated with the narrative material extending from the beginning of the ministry to the Passion and the Resurrection is the foundation

---

[1] Creed, "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems," pp. 106 f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

> document of Luke; that the Marcan material is a secondary addition; and that the removal of the Marcan texts leaves us with an independent non-Marcan source for the whole compass of the Gospel. It is 'the Proto-Luke hypothesis' as thus that I question.[1]

And it is against Proto-Luke as a complete gospel-like document, completely independent of Mark, that Creed's criticisms speak quite forcefully.

A further response to Taylor's views came from C. S. Petrie.[2] While restating some of the factors to which Streeter and Taylor have pointed in asserting the Proto-Luke hypothesis and his own preference for the view that it is Mark which provides the framework and primary source for Luke, Petrie focused on the method which Streeter and Taylor used in presenting their hypothesis. It is the division of materials into Markan and non-Markan groupings by Streeter and Taylor which Petrie felt obscured the fact that the Gospel as a whole follows the Markan order.[3] Petrie asserts,

---

[1] Creed, "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems," p. 103.

[2] C. S. Petrie, "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis," _Exp_. _T_., LIV (1943), 172-177. This article appeared in response to Taylor's article, "After Fifty Years: I. The Gospel and the Gospels," _Exp_. _T_., L (1939), 8-12.

[3] Petrie, pp. 173 f.

> The attractive arrangement and presentation of their materials may, without deliberate intention, win support for the case at the expense of the facts. The several sections of Luke, and not any artificial grouping of them, must be kept in their proper and known sequence within the whole.[1]

A more recent response to the Proto-Luke hypothesis is that of S. MacLean Gilmour.[2] After examining the material generally designated as QL, or Proto-Luke, Gilmour doubts that this material can apart from Mark be regarded as "having had a beginning that would entitle it to be called a gospel."[3] His verdict is well stated in the words of J. M. Creed that the subtraction of Markan material leaves an "amorphous collection of narrative and discourses."[4]

Aside from the criticisms of the Proto-Luke hypothesis cited above, most responses to the hypothesis put forth by Streeter and Taylor have not reflected consideration in depth of the issues involved. Just as Taylor could say that most of the opponents of the Proto-Luke hypothesis "content themselves with vague expressions of dissent,"[1] so Petrie was able to reply, "The hypothesis is often accepted with equal facility."[2] Both of these statements are indicative of the fact that the Proto-Luke hypothesis has not received the consideration which such a proposal deserves. Perhaps the Streeter hypothesis has not gained the attention it deserves because of the time at which it appeared, for attention had already begun to shift from source criticism to form criticism[3] following the works of such men as Martin Dibelius[4] and Karl Ludwig Schmidt.[5] Since that time form criticism has continued to claim the primary attention of New Testament scholars to the degree that C. K. Barrett could assert in 1961, "They have abandoned the old search for literary sources."[6] The Proto-Luke hypothesis has still not gained the attention which it deserves. Yet scholars have continued to express their views on the Proto-Luke hypothesis. All too often their acceptance or rejection has continued to be too facile or in "vague expressions of dissent," or assent. The list of those scholars who do not find the Proto-Luke hypothesis convincing has grown long, but most do not find it necessary to defend in detail their dismissal of this alternative. Among these are Wilhelm Bussmann,[1] Rudolf Bultmann,[2] C. J. Cadoux,[3] Kendrick Grobel,[4] G. D. Kilpatrick,[5] Wilhelm Michaelis,[6] G. W. H. Lampe,[7] F. W. Beare,[8] and R. M. Grant.[9]

---

[1] Petrie, p. 174.

[2] S. MacLean Gilmour, "A Critical Re-examination of Proto-Luke," JBL, LXVII (1948), 143-152, and "The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1952), VIII, 16.

[3] Gilmour, "A Critical Re-examination," p. 147.

[4] Creed, St. Luke, p. lviii.

---

[1] Taylor, "After Fifty Years," p. 8.

[2] Petrie, "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis," p. 174.

[3] Francis W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 15.

[4] Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, translated by Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935). First German edition, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (1919).

[5] Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitzsch und Sohn, 1919).

[6] Barrett, Luke the Historian, p. 51.

---

[1] Wilhelm Bussmann, Synoptische Studien, vol. III (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1931), pp. 133 ff.

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated by John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), p. 447.

[3] Cecil J. Cadoux, The Life of Jesus (West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1948), p. 14.

[4] Kendrick Grobel, Formgeschichte und Synoptische Quellenanalyse (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1937), pp. 84 ff.

[5] G. D. Kilpatrick, "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke xxxii.47." JTS, XLIII (1942), 34-36.

[6] Wilhelm Michaelis, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Bern: Buchdruckerei F. Graf-Lehmann, 1946), pp. 63 ff.

[7] G. W. H. Lampe, "Luke," Peake's Commentary of the Bible, edited by Matthew Black (revised edition; London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), p. 820.

[8] F. W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 15.

[9] R. M. Grant, A Historical Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 118.

A smaller group of those accepting the Proto-Luke hypothesis includes T. W. Manson,[1] T. Henshaw,[2] F. C. Grant,[3] Owen E. Evans,[4] A. Q. Morton,[5] Stephen Neill,[6] and Joachim Jeremias.[7] Even with such formidable groupings of opponents and proponents of the hypothesis, there is still a pressing need for a thorough reconsideration of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. This need remains as intense as it was in 1939 when Taylor pleaded,

> A more considered verdict on the part of New Testament scholars regarding the hypothesis as a whole, or at least the claim that a fusion of Q and L is the fundamental element in the structure of the Third

---

[1] T. W. Manson, "Life of Jesus: A Survey of Available Material. (3) Work of St. Luke," Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XXVII (1944), 382-403.

[2] T. Henshaw, New Testament Literature (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1952), p. 131.

[3] F. C. Grant, The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 119.

[4] Owen E. Evans, "Synoptic Criticism since Streeter," Exp. T., LXXII (1960-61), 296.

[5] A. Q. Morton and G. H. C. Macgregor, The Structure of Luke and Acts (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 26.

[6] Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 124.

[7] Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, translated by Norman Perrin from the third edition with the author's revisions (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), p. 99.

> Gospel, is greatly to be desired in the interest of Synoptic research.[1]

Despite the work of men such as Petrie and Gilmour in the meantime, the demand for a more thorough study of the Proto-Luke hypothesis was still such that in 1951 A. M. Hunter could write,

> So twenty-five years after its propounding, the hypothesis remains hypothetical. If scholars like T. W. Manson and C. J. Cadoux have accepted it, J. M. Creed and W. Bussmann have rejected it. It has not been disproved, but certain pillars on which it rested have weakened under criticism; and few scholars are prepared in constructive work to commit themselves to its truth. Yet the hypothesis is not only interesting, but important. For, if it were established, we should have in Proto-Luke an authority for the Life of Jesus as old as Mark, independent of it, and of comparable value. We may hope that in the next decade or two we may have a decision on it one way or the other from scholars ready to undertake the linguistic spade-work which such a decision will involve.[2]

The world of New Testament scholarship still awaits the decision for which Hunter called sixteen years ago. While there have been attempts to explore, in one fashion or another, the problem of sources in Luke, there has been no comprehensive investigation of the problem. The works of

---

[1] Taylor, "After Fifty Years," p. 8.

[2] A. M. Hunter, Interpreting the New Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951), p. 42.

W. L. Knox,[1] L. Gaston,[2] Paul Winter,[3] Heinz Schürmann,[4] and F. Rehkopf[5] indicate that there is a renewal of interest in the problem of sources in the Third Gospel. The investigations of Harald Sahlin reflect the continuing interest in the Proto-Luke hypothesis itself.[6] At the same time, however,

---

1. W. L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, vol. II: St. Luke and St. Matthew (Cambridge: University Press, 1957).

2. L. Gaston, "Sondergut und Markusstoff in Lk. 21," Theologische Zeitschrift, XVI (1960), 161-172.

3. Paul Winter, "The Treatment of His Sources by the Third Evangelist in Luke XXI-XXIV," Studia Theologica, VIII (1954), 138-172.

4. Heinz Schürmann, Der Abendmahlsbericht, Lucas 22,7-38 (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1963) and Eine Quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischer Abendmahlsberichts, Lk. 22,7-38. I. Teil: "Das Paschmahlbericht, Lk. 22,7-18," Neutestamentliche Adhandlungen, XIX (1953), 1-123; II. Teil: "Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk. 22,19-20," Neutestamentliche Adhandlungen, XX (1953), 1-153; and III. Teil: "Jesu Abschiedsrede, Lk. 22,21-38," Neutestamentliche Adhandlungen, XX (1957), 1-160.

5. Friedrich Rehkopf, Die lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch, vol. 5 of Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, edited by Joachim Jeremias and Otto Michel (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959).

6. Harald Sahlin, Studien zum Dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1949) and Der Messias und das Gottesvolk, vol. XII of Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici, edited by A. Fridrichsen (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1945). Proto-Luke is, however, defined by Sahlin in terms quite different from those of Streeter and Taylor. For Sahlin, Proto-Luke is an Aramaic document.

the main lines of critical work dealing with the Gospel of Luke have given little attention to the problem of sources in Luke. For the most part, work goes on as if a final solution to the problem of sources and their use could be assumed--namely, that Mark is the framework for the Gospel of Luke.

A widely recognized representative of this position is Hans Conzelmann, who begins his work on Luke with the assumption that the Third Evangelist is dependent on the Markan framework.[1] Conzelmann is, however, but a representative of the growing tendency to accept the Markan framework for Luke without the accompanying consideration which the Proto-Luke alternative deserves.

The value and importance of the work of Conzelmann and others on the Third Gospel should not be underestimated. Before such work proceeds too rapidly and too far, however, is is desirable that we should determine whether the basic assumption concerning Luke's sources is well grounded. Should we find that this is not the case, it is self-evident that the earlier a word of caution can be raised the better it will be. If, on the other hand, the postulation of the Marcan framework for the Third Gospel is valid, then its validity should be demonstrated and not merely assumed. If this could be done, it would put the current movement of redaktionsgeschichtliche interpretation on a more solid basis than has heretofore been the case. It is the purpose of this project to study the Gospel of Luke itself in order to re-examine and evaluate the Proto-Luke hypothesis. We may hope that this study will lead in the direction of a better grounded decision about Proto-Luke.

---

[1] Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke. W. C. Robinson, Jr., summarizes well what has come to be the standard position represented by Conzelmann in Lucan studies. See Robinson, The Way of the Lord (Basel dissertation, 1961; published privately in English in 1962), pp. 1-42.

Before we begin our study of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, it is necessary that we first outline more fully the Proto-Luke hypothesis as it has been stated by Streeter and Taylor.

Streeter begins his work with the conclusions reached by John Hawkins in his essay, "Three Limitations in St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel."[1] Streeter says:

> Sir John there pointed out that, whereas over a large part of his Gospel Luke is clearly reproducing the story of Mark, not only in substance and in order, but with the closest verbal agreements, there are two large tracts, viz. Lk. vi.20-viii.3 and Lk. ix.51-xviii.14, in which he makes no use of Mark at all, or, at most, derives from him a few odd verses. He further shows that in another great tract of the Gospel, the section beginning with the

---

[1] John C. Hawkins, S. S. P., pp. 29-94.

> Last Supper (Lk. xxii.14) and ending with the discovery of the Empty Tomb (Lk. xxiv.12), the relation of the Lucan to the Marcan story in regard to substance, order, and verbal parallelism is entirely different from that in the other sections where Luke appears to be using Mark.[1]

Streeter felt that the evidence which Hawkins marshalled concerning the Lucan Passion narrative points to a conclusion which Hawkins was hesitant to draw--namely, "that Luke is in the main reproducing an account of the Passion parallel to, but independent of, Mark, and enriching it with occasional insertions from Mark."[2]

To these sections, Luke 6:20-8:3; 9:51-18:14; and 22:14-24:53, Streeter added two other non-Marcan sections of the Third Gospel which he attributed to Proto-Luke. These sections are Luke 19:1-27 and 3:1-4:30. The first of these sections, said Streeter, is different from the "great" and "lesser interpolation" only in terms of length, whereas Luke 3:1-4:30 provides a further block of non-Marcan material of considerable length. To this latter segment of non-Marcan material Streeter attached great importance in the development of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, for it provides a good beginning for the "gospel-like" Proto-Luke.

---

[1] Streeter, pp. 201 f.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 202.

When these non-Marcan blocks are taken together, Streeter noted that "they are much larger in extent than the sections derived from Mark."[1] Furthermore, Streeter observed that if we disregard the opening chapters of Luke (Luke 1 and 2)--

> From them [the non-Marcan blocks] comes the beginning, and from them comes the end, of the Gospel. Suppose, then, they stood all together in a simple document--this would form something very like a complete Gospel, opening with the Preaching of John and ending with the Resurrection Appearances. But, if so, it is not the non-Marcan sections, it is those derived from Mark, that should be styled the "interpolations."[2]

In Streeter's own words the Proto-Luke hypothesis is the thesis that "the non-Marcan sections represent a single document, and to Luke this was the framework into which he inserted, at convenient places, the extracts from Mark."[3]

As stated above,[4] Streeter accepts the view that the Gospel of Luke is dependent upon both Q and L. What Streeter wished to effect by his hypothesis was to interpolate a stage between Q and L and the editor of the Third Gospel. Says Streeter:

> I conceive that what this editor had before him was, not Q in its original form--which, I hold, included

---

[1] Streeter, p. 207.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 207 f.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

[4] See above, pp. 13-14.

> hardly any narrative and no account of the Passion--but Q and L, that is, Q embodied in a larger document, a kind of "Gospel" in fact, which I will call Proto-Luke.[1]

In his article in the Hibbert Journal Streeter referred to Proto-Luke as a first edition of the Gospel of Luke. Later, in response to criticism from Arthur Headlam,[2] he was willing to settle for the idea that Proto-Luke may represent a first stage in the composition of the Third Gospel, with Proto-Luke enjoying only "private circulation."[3] In either case it was, according to Streeter, "Luke the companion of Paul" who was responsible for both stages in the composition of the Gospel of Luke. Streeter puts it this way:

> Luke during the two years he was at Caesarea in the company of Paul made good use of his opportunities of collecting information and made copious notes. Later on, probably not till after the death of Paul, a copy of Q came his way, and on the basis of this and his own notes he composed Proto-Luke as a Gospel for the use of the Church in the place where he was then living. Still later a copy of Mark came his way, and he then produced the second and enlarged edition of his Gospel that has come down to us.[4]

---

1. Streeter, p. 208.

2. Arthur C. Headlam, The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ (London: John Murray, 1924), pp. 20 ff.

3. Streeter, p. 221.

4. Ibid., pp. 218 f.

It is the stage at which Luke combined his material whatever its origin, with Q that interests us. It is the product of this stage which Streeter says has been preserved for us in Luke 3:1-4:30; 5:1-11; 6:14-16; 6:20-8:3; 9:51-18:14; 19:1-27, 37-44; 21:18, 34-36; and 24:14 to the end of the Gospel, "except for verses derived from Mark, the identification of which is very problematical,"[1] that form Proto-Luke.

Taylor also places much emphasis on the suggestion that the author of Proto-Luke is Luke himself.[2] He points out that in the matters of style and characteristic ideas no distinction can be made in the work of the one who was the editor of Proto-Luke and he who was the final editor of the Third Gospel as we know it. Words or phrases and ideas which are characteristic of Luke occur both in the sections of the Third Gospel which have been attributed to Proto-Luke and in sections which contain Marcan material. It is, however, just this identity of the author of Proto-Luke and Luke himself which makes the recovery of Proto-Luke well nigh impossible. Ideas or words may be established as characteristic of Luke, but to which stage of his literary work are they to be attributed?

---

[1] Streeter, p. 222.

[2] Taylor, pp. 202-210.

Taylor interprets the preface of Luke, 1:1-4, as supporting the Proto-Luke hypothesis. He suggests that Luke would hardly express his "dissatisfaction with the work of his predecessors only to give an enlarged and improved version of one of their works."[1] On the other hand, if the Third Gospel is the revision of a "first draft" of an early work, might we not expect Luke to mention this fact in his preface?

The study of the Proto-Luke hypothesis is the task of this project. We now turn to an examination of the evidence afforded by the Third Gospel.

1

---

[1] Taylor, p. 198.

Chapter II

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SECTIONS ATTRIBUTED TO PROTO-LUKE

Our aim in this chapter will be to examine the sections of the Third Gospel which Streeter and Taylor have attributed to Proto-Luke by asking the following three questions about these portions of the Gospel of Luke: (1) What right has this section to be called "non-Marcan"? In several cases there is material which has enough similarity to Mark that we must raise the question of the possible use of Mark in the section of which it is a part. (2) What are the narrative episodes of the section? By narrative episode we mean an isolated event which has been incorporated into the over-all narrative structure. It will be helpful to distinguish between the isolated event and the on-going narrative framework. We shall also raise the question of the source of the narrative episodes, in anticipation that this may prepare the way for asking a third question; namely (3), what is the source of the narrative framework which we find in the sections attributed to the hypothetical Proto-Luke? Taylor asserts that the narrative of Proto-Luke is the result of Q being put into a narrative framework.[1] The further question must be asked, however, as to the source of the narrative framework which the Third Evangelist has imposed on Q and the material peculiar to the Third Gospel. In the following analysis these questions will be paradigmatic.

Luke 3:1-4:30

Of the passages which Streeter and Taylor have attributed to Proto-Luke, this section is the most difficult to analyze along the lines of the criteria which we have outlined. Yet both Streeter and Taylor place great emphasis on their analysis of this section as a "non-Marcan" portion of the Third Gospel, for such an analysis suggests that Luke has employed the important opening section of Proto-Luke in much the same form that it stood as the beginning of "something very like a complete Gospel."[2]

---

1. Taylor, p. 185, refers to the second stage in the composition of the Third Gospel, i.e., Proto-Luke, as an "expanded narrative version of Q."

2. Streeter, p. 207.

1. The Question of Marcan Material in Luke 3:1-4:30

The problem of distinguishing Marcan and non-Marcan material in this section is made difficult by the fact that the section includes material which is commonly acknowledged to have been recorded by both Mark and Q.[1] Both Mark and Q seem to have included accounts of the preaching of John the Baptist, the baptism of Jesus, and the temptation. It is not easy, therefore, to determine at every point what source Luke is using in the composition of his account. We must first examine each segment for possible use of Mark in the Lucan narrative. We may begin by further dividing this section of the Third Gospel into three segments: (a) 3:1-20, which concerns John the Baptist; (b) 3:21-4:13, the baptism, genealogy and temptation of Jesus; and (c) 4:14-30, the beginning of the ministry of Jesus.

---

[1] See James Moffatt, _An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament_ (3rd ed., "International Theological Library"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), pp. 210 ff. Each of the numerous attempts to discern the contents of Q which Moffatt has recorded includes some portions of this section of the Third Gospel. The parallels with Mark may be seen by examining a gospel synopsis such as Albert Huck, _Synopsis of the First Three Gospels_, revised by Hans Lietzmann, English edition by F. L. Cross (New York: American Bible Society, 1935).

a. Luke 3:1-20. The sixfold synchronism of verse 1 is obviously partly non-Marcan. Streeter, however, maintains that in spite of parallels with Mark in Luke 3:2-4, a non-Marcan source has been used. He argues that if Q included an account of the preaching of John, the baptism of Jesus, and the temptation, it is natural to assume that Q also included some introduction to the account of the Baptist.[1] Because both Mark and Q are reporting the same event, their accounts must be similar in nature. As both Streeter[2] and Taylor[3] note, the verbal agreement between Luke 3:2b-4 and Mark 1:2-5 is such that it cannot be ignored. Nor can the verbal agreement be reduced to the one phrase βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφισεν ἁμαρτιῶν in Luke 3:3 as Streeter suggests in his analysis. Although the Lucan order in verses 2b-4 is somewhat different from the Marcan order, the verbal agreement is sufficient to suggest that at least in verses 2b-4 Luke is using Mark as a source. The words which Luke has in common with Mark 1:2-5 are underlined:

---

[1] Streeter, p. 206. See also Streeter, "The Original Extent of Q," S. S. P., pp. 185 ff.

[2] Streeter, p. 205.

[3] Taylor, p. 77.

> 'Εγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ 'Ιωάννην τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν
> ἐν τῆ ἐρήμῳ. καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πασαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ
> 'Ιορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν
> ἁμαρτιῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων 'Ησαΐου τοῦ
> προφήτου· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῆ ἐρήμῳ ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν
> ὁδὸν κυρίου εὐθείας ποιειτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

The one significant change which does occur in Luke is the change from ἡ 'Ιουδαία χώρα (Mark 1:5) to πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ 'Ιορδάνου. Rather than assuming a source other than Mark, this alteration can be better explained as a conscious change by Luke who seems to envision John's ministry as being restricted to the region of Jordan.[1] Streeter suggests that the application of the prophecy of Isaiah 40:4,5 "was probably a piece of primitive Christian apologetic antecedent to all written documents, and therefore probably stood in Q as well as in Mark."[2] Such a suggestion must remain hypothetical since Matthew has not preserved for us a form of the quotation which would suggest that Luke has taken this form of the Isaiah quotation from Q. Luke on his own may have continued the quotation of Isaiah 40:4,5. There is little reason for us to resort to Streeter's hypothesis when

---

1. See below, p. 157, for a discussion of the sphere of John's ministry.

2. Streeter, p. 206.

we know that Luke knew and used Mark as a source. It appears that Mark underlies Luke 3:2b-4.

The content of the preaching of the Baptist is of two types. First, there is the preaching of repentance in verses 7-9, followed by its implications in verses 10-14. Verses 7-9 have their parallel in Matthew and appear to come from Q. On the other hand, verses 10-14 are peculiar to Luke. Second, there is the messianic preaching of John in verses 15-18. Verse 15 functions as a transition which has been made necessary by the insertion of the social teaching of John and is peculiar to Luke. Verse 16 gives evidence of being dependent on Mark and demands closer examination.

In Luke 3:16 where there is extensive verbal agreement with Mark 1:7-8, Streeter again resorts to the argument that "Q must have had something more or less equivalent."[1] While this may be the case, the fact remains that the form which Luke has used agrees verbally with Mark in the words which are underlined: ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίω καὶ πυρί.[2]

---

[1] Streeter, p. 206.

[2] καὶ πυρί may also represent the influence of Q.

We must note that Luke has transposed the order of Mark in verse 16 so that the order agrees more with Matthew 3:11 than with Mark 1:7-8. Still the verbal agreement between Luke and Mark is more impressive than between Luke and Matthew at this point. Indeed the verbal agreement with Mark is more impressive than the agreement in order with Matthew. Such extensive verbal agreement seems to undercut Streeter's argument as stated above. Luke does appear to have used Mark at least in verse 16. The fact that he has followed Q in verse 17 does not mean that he could not have used Mark in verse 16 as Taylor seems to suggest. Rather Luke seems to have filled out Mark with Q.

Verse 18 is a statement of summary and transition. It is peculiar to Luke and prepares the way for verses 19-20 which present in a distinctively Lucan manner an aspect of the tradition of John which appears to be dependent on Mark 6:17 f. Luke has used the material on the imprisonment of John here in order to remove John from the scene before the beginning of the ministry of Jesus.[1]

b. Luke 3:21-4:13. It is difficult to decide whether Mark or Q is the source for Luke's account of the baptism. At several points there is agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark. Where Matthew has ἠνεῴχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί and Luke has ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν, Mark has σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς. Both Matthew and Luke have ἐπ' αὐτόν where Mark has εἰς αὐτόν.[1] Furthermore, it is probable, as Taylor suggests, that Q had an account of the baptism, for such seems to be required to connect Q's account of John with the narrative of the temptation of Jesus.[2] If, as seems preferable,[3] the Western reading of the conclusion of verse 22 (ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε) is accepted, this adds additional support for the case that Luke has used Q for his account of the baptism. Streeter comments:

---

[1] See below, p. 160.

> Q, therefore, must have contained an account of the baptism. But whereas in Mark's version the voice

---

[1] See Taylor, p. 77, and Streeter, p. 206.

[2] Taylor, p. 77. See also J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan and Company, 1930), p. 55. This work will be cited hereafter as Creed, followed by the page reference.

[3] See Streeter, pp. 206, 188. See also Adolf Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus*, translated by J. R. Wilkinson ("Crown Theological Library"; New York: Putnam, 1908), p. 310. See also Leander E. Keck, "Jesus' Entrance upon His Mission," *R. Exp.*, LXIV (Fall, 1967), 473, n. 34, which presents in capsule form the more important aspects of the textual problem.

> from heaven is "Thou art my beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased," in Q it probably read as "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee;" which is the reading of the Western text of Luke, and is undoubtedly right. As has been already pointed out, . . . it can be traced back to Justin Martyr; and since it is a reading which not only introduces a discrepancy between the Gospels but also seems to favor what was later regarded as the dangerous heresy that Jesus only became Son of God at His Baptism, its "correction" in the Alexandrian MSS. is easy to explain. But if Luke wrote this, and that with Mark in front of him, it must have been because it stood in his other source.[1]

These several factors overshadow the limited verbal agreement between Luke and Mark in the account of the baptism of Jesus. It appears, then, that Q underlies the Lucan account of the baptism.

The genealogy in Luke 3:23-38 is unquestionably non-Marcan. The question of its relation to the Matthean genealogy is beyond the scope of our present task. We shall deal later with the significance of the genealogy for Luke.[2]

The story of the temptation begins in Luke in a manner which is characteristic of the Third Evangelist.[3]

---

[1] Streeter, p. 188.

[2] See below, n. 2, p. 161.

[3] Note, for example, such typically Lucan phrases as πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου and ἐν τῷ πνεύματι. For a listing

Despite the Lucan character of this transition, there is marked verbal agreement between Luke 4:1b-2a and Mark 1:13. In the light of this verbal parallelism we must question the assertion of Taylor: "As regards the Temptation (iv.1-13), which follows the Genealogy (iii.23-38), the source is clearly Q."[1] While we can readily see from a comparison of Matthew and Luke that the content of the temptation is derived from Q, such cannot be asserted so dogmatically about the introduction of the story where Luke seems to be dependent on Mark. In Luke 4:1b-2a the Lucan account has in common with Mark the words which are underlined in the following quotation: καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῶ πνεύματι ἐν τῆ ἐρήμω ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.[2] Luke seems to have provided his own introductory transition (verse 1a). He has used Mark

---

of expressions characteristic of Luke see Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 15-23, 27-29, 35-51; H. J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke. II. The Treatment of Sources in the Gospel* ("Harvard Theological Studies," VI; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920), pp. 73-205; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* ("International Critical Commentary"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), pp. xli-lxvi.

[1] Taylor, p. 77.

[2] In Luke 4:1b-2a, Luke has in common with Matthew only the use of the verb ἄγειν (though in a different tense) and the noun διαβόλου.

as a source to relate the story of Jesus' being led into the wilderness to be tempted (verses 1b-2a). In verse 2b there is evidence of dependence on **Q**, for where Mark says καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ,[1] Luke and Matthew speak of his hunger. This in turn becomes the basis for the threefold temptation in which the First and Third Gospels agree to such a degree that there can be little doubt that **Q** was their source.

c. Luke 4:14-30. The two verses, Luke 4:14-15, serve as a connecting summary between the story of the temptation and the rejection at Nazareth. Verse 14, although omitting the reference to the imprisonment of John,[2] follows the Marcan order with reference to Jesus' return to Galilee. Also, verse 14 refers to the Spirit in a way that is characteristic of Luke.[3] There is little reason to resort to the hypothetical dependence on **Q** at this point[4] when both Matthew and Luke agree with Mark. Verse 15 is a summary which is probably dependent on neither Mark nor Q. The reference to the synagogue as the place of Jesus' teaching[1] and the use of the verb δοξάζειν[2] suggest motifs which are typically Lucan. The present form of verses 14 and 15 seems, therefore, to be the result of Luke's editorial work. It is possible, however, that this Lucan summary is influenced by the Marcan summary of the preaching of Jesus in Mark 1:14-15, although the content of the message is deleted.

---

[1] The failure of Mark to mention Jesus' hunger along with this statement may be taken to imply that the ἄγγελοι fed Jesus.

[2] Luke has already reported the imprisonment of John in Luke 3:19-20.

[3] For discussion of Luke's emphasis on the Spirit, see below, pp. 152 f.

[4] Compare Streeter, p. 207.

The stage is set by Luke 4:14-15 for the story of the rejection at Nazareth, which Luke may have intended as a substitute for Jesus' preaching which he omitted from Mark 1:15. Hugh Anderson's article, "Broadening Horizons: The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Luke 4:16-30 in Light of Recent Critical Trends,"[3] provides a summary of recent criticism on this passage. It has been suggested frequently that it is Luke's version of Mark 6:1-6.[4] The lack of verbal parallelism is, however, against this argument. It seems more likely that Luke is using a source in addition to Mark at this point. The assumption of the Lucan story that Jesus has already performed deeds in Capernaum indicates that Luke may have been influenced by the Marcan account of the rejection at Nazareth.[1]

---

[1] See Keck, in *R*. *Exp*., LXIV (Fall, 1967), 477.

[2] Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 17.

[3] *Interpretation*, XVII (1964), 259-275.

[4] "Most critics agree with Augustine that this narrative and Mark vi.1f. deal with the same event."--Creed, p. 65.

In looking back over this section (Luke 3:1-4:30) which Streeter and Taylor have called non-Marcan, let us summarize our findings. Our analysis reveals that though there is a preponderance of non-Marcan material in this section, there are some small portions which cannot resist the Marcan label. Luke 3:2b-4, 16; 4:1b-2a and 14 show evidence of being dependent on Mark rather than on Q. While it is true that Taylor acknowledges that Luke 3:2b-4 and 16 are from Mark, he does not allow that Luke 4:1b-2a and 14 are from Mark.[1] The presence of these Marcan elements is sufficient reason for not calling this a non-Marcan section of the Third Gospel. Rather there is a mixture of Marcan and non-Marcan material. The solution which Taylor offers for the presence of the Marcan material, which he admits to be present in this section of the Third Gospel, is that whatever Marcan elements may be found in this section of the Third Gospel are insertions of Marcan material into an already existing narrative. We cannot judge the legitimacy of this statement until after we have analyzed both the narrative episodes and the narrative framework of this portion of the Gospel of Luke.

---

[1] Streeter suggests that the reference to Ναζαρά in Matthew 4:13 and in Luke 4:16 is due to "a brief notice of the change of scene in which the name Ναζαρά occurred."--P. 206. Streeter's argument is based on two observations: (1) that there is reference to Nazareth in both Matthew 4:13 and Luke 4:16, and (2) that the spelling in both cases is Ναζαρά, a spelling which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. While Streeter's suggestion remains a possibility, it seems more probable that the Matthean reference to Nazareth is a Matthean insertion to underscore the importance which Nazareth holds for him. The agreement between Matthew 4:13 and Luke 4:16 in the spelling Ναζαρά may simply be an example of conflation which is so frequent in the texts of the Synoptic Gospels.

2. The Narrative Episodes of Luke 3:1-4:30

The narrative episodes in this portion of the Third Gospel include the appearance of the Baptist, the imprisonment of John, the baptism of Jesus, and the temptation. The second of these, the imprisonment of John, is the product of Luke's own editorial freedom.[2] As for the remaining items, we have seen that Mark and Q seem to have overlapped in their presentation with the result that it is difficult to determine the source to which they owe most. The account of the appearance of the Baptist is, as we have seen, largely dependent on Q, but with definite traces of the influence of Mark. We cannot be sure of the source of the episode as a whole. The case is much the same with the accounts of the baptism and temptation. Luke is using Q material, but traces of Mark make it difficult to determine with certainty the source of the narrative, except in the detailed presentation of the content of the temptation in Luke 4:3-13, which is quite obviously derived from Q. We can only say that the source of the narrative episodes in Luke 3:1-4:30 is as difficult to determine as is the source of the material in general. There is a mixture of Q and Mark which is difficult to unravel, with material from L being used in the rejection at Nazareth pericope.

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 76 f.

[2] See below, p. 157.

3. The Narrative Framework of Luke 3:1-4:30

Having already examined the narrative episodes of Luke 3:1-4:30, we shall now attempt to look more broadly at the narrative framework of this section of the Third Gospel. We have seen in this section a mixture of Marcan, Q, and special Lucan elements. In focusing on the narrative framework of this section, we need not consider the material from Luke's special source, which appears only in the account of the rejection at Nazareth. By taking a broader view of the material, is it possible to determine which source, Mark or Q, is most formative in the section as a whole? As we have already seen in our analysis, in bulk there is more evidence of Q than of Mark in this section of Luke's Gospel. Can the same be said of the narrative framework? The fact that Mark and Q overlap makes a decision on this question difficult. It is possible to assume with Streeter that at the points where the Third Gospel seems to be dependent on Mark that some narrative bridge was also present in Q and that Luke is dependent on Q rather than on Mark. We must, however, observe that it is at just these important points of transition that the use of Q becomes most hypothetical and the verbal parallels between Luke and Mark are greatest. The points at which the use of Mark is evident are also important points for the over-all narrative structure of this section. Luke 3:2b-4 forms a part of the introductory sentence for all of the material on the Baptist. Luke 4:1b-2a is important for the transition from the genealogy to the temptation. Furthermore, Luke 4:14 sets the stage for the beginning of the Galilean ministry, starting with the rejection at Nazareth in Luke

4:16-30. The fact that the Marcan material occurs at such pivotal points in the narrative appears to be a crucial factor. This Marcan material is basic to the framework of the narrative. This fact, along with the observation that the Marcan order is basically followed up to the point of the appearance of Jesus to preach in Galilee, makes the presence of Marcan material all the more important. Mark appears to be fundamental for the very structure of the narrative. At the same time the presence of so much non-Marcan material is problematic. To make a judgment regarding the pattern of Luke's use of sources and the Grundschrift of the Lucan narrative as a whole on the basis of the ambiguity of this section would be to move too hastily. It therefore seems unwise to cite the evidence from this section of the Third Gospel as "fundamental" for the case of Luke's disuse of Mark and the existence of a Proto-Luke.[1] We must proceed to analyze the other sections of the Third Gospel which have been attributed to Proto-Luke and hope that the evidence which we find there will point more distinctly to a solution for our problem.

---

[1] Streeter, p. 205.

Luke 5:1-11

1. The Question of Marcan Material in Luke 5:1-11

The story of the miraculous catch of fish is clearly derived by Luke from a source other than Mark. We can, therefore, say with Streeter and Taylor that Luke 5:1-11 is non-Marcan. On the other hand, however, the call of the first apostles is not foreign to Mark.[1] It may perhaps be helpful to attempt to analyze this pericope in such a manner as to focus on both its Marcan and non-Marcan dimensions. This can best be done through an examination of the narrative episodes of this section.

2. The Narrative Episodes of Luke 5:1-11

The history of the material which lies behind Luke's account of the miraculous catch of fish and the call of the first apostles is difficult to determine. The fact that the tradition of the miraculous catch of fish is used in such a different manner by the Fourth Evangelist compounds the difficulty. Rudolf Bultmann has suggested that the Johannine version is derived in some way from Luke.[1] On the other hand, John Bailey sees the Lucan account as being dependent on the tradition which lies behind John 21. He asserts that the statement, "Depart from me, for I am a sinner," in Luke 5:8 makes more sense in the Johannine context as a post-resurrection scene which presupposes the denial of Jesus by Peter.[2] A third alternative is suggested by Martin Dibelius--namely, that the tradition of the miraculous catch of fish first existed as a Peter-centered narrative independent of either the Lucan or the Johannine context.[3] To this Peter-centered tradition Luke added other details, including the call of Peter as a disciple and the reference to the sons of Zebedee as disciples.[4] We have, then, in addition to the main narrative of the miraculous catch, several narrative elements, the source of which we must attempt to ascertain.

---

[1] See Mark 1:16-20.

---

[1] Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated by John Marsh (Oxford: Basil and Blackwell, 1963), pp. 218 f.

[2] John A. Bailey, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, VII; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 12 ff.

[3] Martin Dibelius, From Traditions to Gospel, translated by Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), pp. 112 ff.

[4] Creed, p. 74.

A comparison of the Lucan account of the call of the first disciple with the Marcan account (Mark 1:16) produces some striking parallels. In both, Jesus is beside the lake;[1] and in both, the call of Peter is associated with the call of the sons of Zebedee. Does it not, then, seem quite plausible that these additions made by Luke to the tradition of the miraculous catch have been influenced by Mark 1:16-20? The association is made between Peter the master fisherman and the statement in Mark 1:17: δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων. The choice of Peter as a disciple is, then, related to the choice of James and John. Unless we can assume a standard ordering of the ministry of Jesus to which Streeter and Taylor are willing to resort, it is safer to assume that these narrative elements were added to the story of the miraculous catch by Luke under the influence of the Gospel of Mark, a source which we know that Luke has used.

---

[1] Ἡ λίμη Γεννησαρέτ (Luke 5:1) is just another way of referring to ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας (Mark 1:16). See Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated and adapted from the fourth revised and augmented German edition by William Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 149 and 155.

3. The Narrative Framework of Luke 5:1-11

Little can be said of the narrative framework of this section of the Third Gospel, for in itself it is but an isolated pericope. We may, however, as has just been done, point to the relation between this pericope and the Marcan parallel of the call of the first disciples. Furthermore, there seems to be a point of contact between this pericope and Mark in the preaching from the bow of the boat (Luke 5:3). Luke seems to have borrowed this idea from Mark 4:1, a detail which he has omitted from his later presentation (Luke 8:4-8) of this Marcan material.

Here we simply note that the Third Gospel does not follow the Marcan order in presenting the account of the call of the first disciples.[1] Rather, using primarily non-Marcan materials, Luke has made use of Marcan narrative elements which are hard to disassociate from the framework of the Lucan account. Certainly he does not seem to be following a framework of the Gospel other than Mark; for, as we have observed, with the exception of the reference to the miraculous catch of fish, the narrative elements of this pericope are detachable.

---

[1] We shall later raise the question of whether Luke has special reasons for not following the Marcan order. See below, p. 173.

Luke 6:12-8:3

1. The Question of Marcan Material in Luke 6:12-8:3

The only segment of this section of the Third Gospel which we must consider as possibly being derived from Mark is the opening verses, Luke 6:12-19.[1] In these verses, however, the verbal agreement with Mark is so extensive that the burden of proof is upon one who would wish to suggest that these verses are not from Mark. Nonetheless, Taylor has labeled Luke 6:12-19 as "non-Marcan."

In our analysis let us note, first of all, that Luke has transposed the order of the Marcan material.[2] This alone, however, is not enough to suggest that the source is not Mark. By Taylor's own analysis, the percentage of agreement between Luke 6:12-16 and Mark 3:13-19 is high.[1] Yet, he attempts to minimize the verbal agreement by discounting the names of the disciples and the phrase which introduces them (δώδεκα οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν).[2] As further evidence that Luke 6:12-16 is not dependent on Mark, Taylor cites a number of expressions which are characteristic of the Third Gospel. Taylor says:

---

[1] Indeed, Luke 6:20-8:3 is commonly cited as a non-Marcan section of the Third Gospel. See, for example, James L. Price, _Interpreting the New Testament_ (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), p. 206.

[2] We shall need to consider the reasons for this transposition in the next chapter.

> St. Luke's narrative contains an unusual number of characteristic expressions, such as ἐγένετο with the accusative and infinitive construction, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἦν with the participle, ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσφωνέω. These features, together with the unusual expression τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, and the words διανυκτερεύων and προδότης, seem to indicate something more than stylistic alterations of Mark.[3]

We need to note, however, that with two exceptions[4] these unusual or characteristic expressions occur in the Lucan introduction to this section, Luke 6:12-13a, in which the only clear parallel to Mark is the phrase εἰς τὸ ὄρος. If we observe that the characteristically Lucan phrases are grouped in this introductory statement, they do not disprove the Marcan origin of this section. Rather, they point to the redactional work of Luke in introducing the pericope. They indicate that we should separate this opening statement from the remainder of the paragraph in making an analysis of the verbal agreement of the Lucan and Marcan accounts. The extent of agreement with Mark in Luke 6:13b-16 is thereby raised to approximately seventy percent. We are not able, therefore, to concur with the judgment of Taylor that "the dependence of Luke vi.12-16 upon Mark is negligible."[1]

---

[1] Taylor, p. 80, gives the percentage of verbal agreement with Mark as 44.7.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[4] These two exceptions are προσφωνέω and προδότης. While the form προδότης is used infrequently in the Gospels, it is from the same root as its Marcan parallel (παρέδωκεν).

In Luke 6:17-19 there is once more striking verbal agreement with Mark, despite the fact that Luke has abbreviated the Marcan account of the healing of the multitudes. Once more Taylor seeks to minimize the verbal agreement by stressing that several points of agreement lie in place names. This observation is not, however, sufficient to account for the more than one-third verbal agreement between Luke 6:17-19 and Mark 3:7-12.[2] Taylor further notes characteristically Lucan features of verses 17 and 19.[3] He also notes that there

---

1. Taylor, p. 82.

2. *Ibid*., p. 80. Taylor cites the percentage of words in Luke common to Mark in these verses as 33.8.

3. Note, for example, "the use of nominatives which are construed with ἔστη" and the clause ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ

is no mention of the boat and seaside.[1] In view of our analysis let us make the following observations: (1) as we have noticed already, Luke has abbreviated the Marcan account with the result that it has become more sketchy; (2) as Taylor has noted, Luke 6:12-16 and 17-19 together form an introduction to the Sermon on the Plain;[2] it is, therefore, necessary that the reference to the boat and to the sea be omitted; and (3) the phrase δύναμις παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο καὶ ἰᾶτο πάντας which provides a bridge between the account of the healing and the Sermon on the Plain is, as Taylor has suggested,[3] characteristic of Luke. Thus we need not assume a source other than Mark to provide the introduction to the Sermon on the Plain.[4]

Apart from Luke 6:12-19 there is no portion of this section of the Third Gospel (6:12-8:3) for which there is reason to believe that Mark is being used as a source. But our analysis of Luke 6:12-19 has shown that Taylor has

---

ἐξήρχετο καὶ ἵατο πάντες. See Taylor, p. 83. Also see above, p. 58.

[1] Taylor, p. 83.

[2] *Ibid*.

[3] See above, p. 59, n. 3.

[4] In the next chapter we shall be more concerned with the reasons Luke has used Mark in this manner.

claimed more than is demonstrable in the assertion that the whole of Luke 6:12-8:3 is non-Marcan.[1]

2. Narrative Episodes in Luke 6:12-8:3

We have already seen the dependence of the Third Evangelist on Mark in Luke 6:12-19. The phrase εἰς τὸ ὄρος in Luke 6:12 gives the locale of Jesus' praying and the call of the twelve apostles. The manner in which Luke has reworked Mark in verses 17-19 in order to get to the plain makes the dependence on Mark less obvious. It is, nonetheless, not to be denied.

Luke 6:20-49 is didactic material which the Gospel of Luke has in common with Matthew. We may assume that Q is the source of this material. There are no narrative episodes in Luke 6:20-49.

Beginning with the account of the healing of the centurion's servant in Luke 7:1-10 there is a series of episodes which appear to be loosely connected. The healing of the centurion's servant has its parallel in Matthew 8:5-13 and seems to be from Q. The fact that in both Matthew and

---

[1] We should note that here Streeter and Taylor disagree slightly. Streeter assigns the label "non-Marcan" only to Luke 6:14-16 and 6:20-8:3. Streeter, p. 222.

Luke the centurion is associated with Capernaum indicates that this is probably an association in the tradition which both Matthew and Luke have used.[1] In Luke 7:11-17 the geographic location, Nain, seems to be closely tied to the tradition which in this case is a part of Luke's special material.

The material relating to the Baptist's question and Jesus' response in Luke 7:18-35 has no outstanding narrative elements which help us to ascertain its origin. However, the parallels with Matthew 11:2-19 point to Q as the source.

That the account of the annointing of Jesus by the woman who was a sinner (Luke 7:36-50) is taken by Luke to be a parallel of Mark 14:3-9 seems probable, for he has omitted the latter narrative from his account of the Passion.[2] There seem to have been multiple accounts of the tradition of the annointing of Jesus, as may be seen also from John 12:1-8. It is probable that Luke used a source parallel to the Marcan tradition. Whether this tradition was already merged with the meal in the home of a Pharisee is not clear. The fact that the leper in the Marcan account is named Simon and the Pharisee in the Third Gospel has the same name may indicate that the tradition was in some way connected with one named Simon. More than that we cannot say. The connection of the anointing to the sayings and parable on forgiveness appears to be the work of Luke. It is probable that the tradition of the anointing as used by Luke came to him as an unconnected piece of tradition.[1]

---

[1] In John 4:46-54, the centurion whose son was healed is also associated with Capernaum. Bultmann suggested that the Johannine story is a heightened version of the account in Matthew and Luke. History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 227.

[2] Cf. Creed, p. 109.

The summary statement of Luke 8:1-3 appears to be the editorial work of Luke based on some special tradition from which he derived the names of the women.

In review, we have seen a variety of narrative episodes in this section of the Third Gospel. In Luke 6:12-19 there is a Marcan narrative episode, which is followed by the Sermon on the Plain, apparently derived from Luke's version of Q. Luke 7:1 ff. is also dependent on Q, while in Luke 7:11 ff. the narrative episode comes from Luke's special material. The narrative material in Luke 7:36 and 8:1-3 is primarily the product of Luke's own editorial work. The variety is such that it is not possible to say that in the narrative episodes any one source is dominant.

---

[1] The same seems to be the case in Mark where Mark 14:3-9 is easily disconnected from the context and Mark 14:10 follows well after Mark 14:2.

3. The Narrative Framework of Luke 6:12-8:3

The framework of this section of the Third Gospel is based more on content than on narrative sequence. The stage is set for the Sermon on the Plain by the use of Marcan material in Luke 6:12-19, but beyond that point the sequence is developed in terms of the relation of the content of one section to another. The Sermon on the Plain is given as a unit, ending with a plea for faith and action (Luke 6:46 ff.). The story of the healing of the centurion's servant then follows, depicting the centurion as a type of the believing Gentile, while Jesus proclaims: οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ 'Ισραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον. A second example of faith is seen in the widow at Nain. This is in a sense a doublet of the centurion's faith, while it provides a further backdrop of miraculous action against which the encounter with the disciples of the Baptist is to be seen.[1] There is also a carryover in content from the story of the raising of the widow's son at Nain to the statement of Jesus to the followers of the Baptist in Luke 7:22: νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται.[1] The reply of Jesus to the Baptist's disciples concludes in Luke 7:34 with ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε· ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. This statement prepares the way for Jesus' eating with the Pharisee and the anointing by the sinful woman in Luke 7:36-50. Thus the relation of content leads us from pericope to pericope to the summary statement with which this section of the Third Gospel concludes in Luke 8:3.

---

[1] Creed, p. 103.

As we review this section and observe the lack of narrative framework, the more impressive appears the only narrative structure which this section seems to have--namely, the setting which was given to the Sermon on the Plain in Luke 6:12-19. From that point to Luke 7:50, pericope follows pericope on the basis of content from the Sermon on the Plain until the sequence is broken off with a summary statement in Luke 8:1-3, and we return to the Marcan framework at Luke 8:4. Indeed the reference to γυναῖκές τινες αἳ ἦσαν τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν has overtones which go back to Luke 6:18 f. which is Marcan, for there is no reference to the healing of women from that point to Luke 8:3. In the absence of any other narrative framework, we must acknowledge Luke's dependence on the Marcan structure even at this point where the insertion of material on the basis of content has obscured his use of the Marcan framework. The setting for the whole is provided by Luke 6:12-19 which, though it has been reworked by Luke, is, nonetheless, Marcan.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 150.

Luke 9:51-18:14

1. The Question of Marcan Material in Luke 9:51-18:14

There are few segments in this lengthy section of the Third Gospel which reflect the use of Mark by Luke. There are, nonetheless, some features in this portion of Luke which have parallels in Mark. In several of these instances Luke appears to be using a tradition parallel to Mark, rather than using Mark as a source. We must examine the points of possible contact with Mark.

The sending out of the seventy in Luke 10:1-16 has some similarities to Mark 6:7-11. Streeter asserts that Luke is using Q as his source rather than Mark. We must concur with Streeter's conclusion, for, as he has noted--

> The five words . . . common to Mark vi.7-11 and Luke x.1-12 (I do not count καὶ, ἂν and μή, the

> definite article and personal pronouns, which for this purpose are not significant) "wallet," "enter," "house," "remain," "feet,"[1] are such as must occur in any version of this discourse.[2]

Furthermore, the Lucan account is a charge to seventy, whereas the Marcan version is addressed to the twelve. Perhaps most important is the fact that Luke has already used Mark 6:7-11 in Luke 9:1-5. Whether the Marcan and Q accounts are parallel accounts of one episode as Streeter feels or not, we cannot say.[3] We can assert more firmly, however, that Luke did not view them as such. He has used the Marcan account in Luke 9:1-5, but he has utilized the Q material in Luke 10:1-16.

The lawyer's question in Luke 10:25 and Jesus' response in verses 26-27 serve as an introduction to the parable of the Good Samaritan. This introductory dialogue has similarities with Mark 12:28-31. The verbal agreement between this section and Mark 12:28 ff. is, however, very limited except in the quotation of Deuteronomy 6:5. While the Lucan presentation of this dialogue may be modeled after the Marcan account, the fact that the quotation of Deuteronomy 6:5 (without ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ , κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστιν) begins in the same way in Luke and Matthew probably indicates the use of a parallel account from **Q** rather than dependence on Mark at this point.[1] Furthermore, Luke has the material in a different context from Mark. Still his omission of the material in Mark 12:28-31 from its Marcan context indicates his awareness of the similarity between Mark 12:12-31 and Luke 10:25-27. In light of this fact, we cannot rule out the possibility that Luke has used Mark to provide the setting for the parable of the Good Samaritan. He has used the parable to illustrate who one's neighbor is.[2]

---

[1] The corresponding Greek words are βαλλάντιον, εἰσέλθητε, οἰκίαν, μένετε and πόδας.

[2] Streeter, p. 190.

[3] That Matthew so viewed these two accounts is made clear by the fact that he has conflated the Marcan and Q materials. See Matthew 10:5-16.

Again in the Lucan account of the Beelzebub controversy (Luke 11:14-23) we have an example of Luke's use of material in which there are parallels in Mark and **Q**. On first examination the verbal agreement seems to indicate Luke's use of Mark.[3] Upon closer examination, however, we find that in two of the three verses (15, 17, and 18) where there is closest verbal agreement between Luke and Mark,

---

[1] Cf. Creed, p. 151.

[2] See below, p. 203.

[3] Note especially Luke 11:15, 17, and 18.

Luke follows the syntactical pattern of Matthew and thereby indicates a dependence on Q. Luke 11:17b begins with πᾶσα βασιλεία and is followed by the participle διαμερισθεῖσα. Matthew has a similar syntactical arrangement,[1] while Mark has a conditional sentence with ἐὰν and the subjunctive μερισθῆ. In Luke 11:18 there is verbal agreement with both Mark and Matthew. There is again, however, syntactical agreement with Matthew, for both have an interrogative construction[2] while Mark makes an affirmative statement. The Third Evangelist appears to be using Q as his source. That he is not unmindful of the Marcan parallel is, however, indicated by his omission of the Marcan account in its own setting.

There are, in addition to the passages which we have already examined, a few shorter passages in which there is some similarity with Mark. These include Luke 13:18-19, 30; 16:18; and 17:2. In each case, however, there is evidence of parallel accounts in Mark and Q and, therefore, little reason to believe that Luke has used Mark as his source.[1]

---

[1] Matthew 12:25 has πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα.

[2] Luke has εἰ δὲ και ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη, πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; Matthew has καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανο͂ν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτόν ἐμερίσθη· πῶς οὖν σταθήσται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; Mark has καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη οὐ δύναται στῆναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει.

In summary, we may then say that there is little reason to question the long-accepted description of Luke 9:51-18:14 as a non-Marcan portion of the Third Gospel. On this matter we agree with Taylor and Streeter. There is no clear instance of Marcan material in this section of Luke. Let us look next at the more important question of narrative episodes in Luke 9:51-18:14.

2. Narrative Episodes in Luke 9:51-18:14

It is difficult to analyze the narrative episodes of this section of the Third Gospel, since it is predominantly discourse material.[2] As we have already seen, this section of Luke is non-Marcan. Most of the material in it comes from either Q or Luke's special material. There are, however, narrative elements which do not seem to come from either Q or Luke's special material. As we shall see, discourse materials have been placed in artificial settings with few details given, but have been joined together by brief narrative elements. This practice of inserting brief narrative elements makes it difficult at points to separate narrative elements as episodic event from narrative framework. Nevertheless, we must make such an attempt. In this section we shall seek to determine the source of the various narrative episodes. We shall analyze the narrative framework of Luke 9:51-18:14 in the following section.

---

[1] Streeter, pp. 186 ff.

[2] It has long been recognized that the narrative episodes in the Lucan travel narrative are few. See, for example, Karl L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919), pp. 246-272.

The introductory paragraph of the travel narrative, Luke 9:51-56, sets the stage for the whole of this section.[1] Still it is in itself a narrative episode in which Jesus sends out messengers to precede him. Moreover, this pericope combines typically Lucan elements with explicit details.[2]

---

[1] It actually sets the stage for the development of the Third Gospel up to the point when Jesus reaches the Temple in Jerusalem in Luke 19:45. For our immediate purpose, however, we shall focus our discussion upon the section Luke 9:51-18:14. This is not meant to deny that there is movement toward the goal of Jerusalem even before this point in the narrative (see Luke 9:31). See Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Beiheft 21 of *Z. N. W.* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 183-185, and W. C. Robinson, Jr., *The Way of the Lord* (a 1961 Basel dissertation published privately in English, 1962), pp. 43-61. Both Schubert and Robinson emphasize a movement toward Jerusalem which begins before Luke 9:51. To affirm this is, however, in no sense a denial that there is a major break at Luke 9:51 in terms of literary structure.

[2] Typically Lucan elements include the use of ἐν τῷ plus an infinitive, the theme of ἀναλήμψις and the repeated use of

It is, therefore, difficult to determine whether this episode is from Luke's special material or is his own creation. It is perhaps a combination of both.

The account of the sending and return of the seventy disciples, Luke 10:1-20, is basically episodic in nature, although it is for the most part a discourse consisting of Jesus' instruction to the seventy. Verses 1 and 17 provide the only narrative elements in the episode. The discourse material is put into the framework provided by these narrative elements in order to create a more complete episode. As we have noted above,[1] there appears to have been two accounts of Jesus' giving instruction to his disciples before sending them out, one found in Mark and the other in Q. It seems that Luke has kept these accounts separate, whereas Matthew has conflated the two.[2] Taylor is probably correct in his assertion that the account in Q was connected to the seventy and that Luke has preserved this connection.[3]

---

the verb πορεύομαι . On the other hand, the explicit mention of named persons is not a characteristic addition.

[1] See above, p. 67.

[2] See Matthew 10:1-15.

[3] Taylor, p. 153. On the other hand, Creed contends that the narrative introduction belongs to Luke. He observes

The account of Jesus' visit with Mary and Martha in Luke 10:38-42 is the first clear example of Luke's use of a narrative episode in the form in which he took it from his source.[1] Here the Third Evangelist has used material peculiar to Luke. Within the episode itself there are no typically Lucan words or motifs which reflect Luke's editorial work. There is, however, evidence that Luke has added his own editorial touches in providing a setting for the episode. The phrase ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτούς is so typically Lucan that it can be assigned to the Third Evangelist with little reservation.[2]

The lengthy segment of the Lucan travel narrative from Luke 11:1-12:59 is without a narrative episode. Once more the

---

that "moreover the narrative introduction does not altogether fit the charge: Jesus is said to dispatch the disciples by twos to every city where he himself would come, like the messengers referred to above (v. 52); the charge, however, implies an independent ministry without direct reference to the approach of Jesus in person. Again the return of the seventy in a body to Jesus does not easily harmonise with the conception that they had been sent out in advance by twos to every city and place where he would come."--Creed, p. 144

[1] This is not to say that Luke has not used source material in other episodes which we have examined. He does appear, however, to have used this episode more as it stood in his source.

[2] See Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 15 ff., for a list of typically Lucan words and phrases.

Third Evangelist has used brief narrative elements to unite varied discourse materials.[1]

The next narrative episode is briefly related in Luke 13:1 f. This material is peculiar to Luke and seems to come from Luke's special source. This brief episode is limited to a discussion about an occurrence which is herein only reported. There is a reversion to dialogue and discourse in Luke 13:2-9.

Luke 13:10-17 is one of the most distinct narrative episodes in the entire travel narrative section of the Third Gospel. The account of the healing of the woman with a spirit of infirmity is an episode in its own right. Nonetheless, Luke himself seems to provide the immediate setting (ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν).[2] This episode is also peculiar to the Gospel of Luke.

The account of the healing of a man with dropsy in Luke 14:1-3 is a brief narrative episode, again peculiar to Luke. The episode can be detached; but as it stands, it is used to initiate the discussion between Jesus and those with whom he was eating.

---

[1] We shall consider these short narrative elements under the next heading.

[2] This introduction may have been prompted by the reference to ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος in verse 14.

The final narrative episode in this portion of the Third Gospel is found in Luke 17:11-19. This account of the healing of the ten lepers, while introduced by the typically Lucan clause, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, is from Luke's special material. This unit stands as a whole. The dialogue is a part of the episode itself.

In reviewing Luke 9:51-18:14, let us note again the extremely limited scope of narrative episodes in this section of the Third Gospel. The narrative episodes are too limited in scope to provide anything like a framework for the travel narrative as a whole. The scattered episodes are rather subsumed within a framework to which they originally had little or no connection. This leads to the important question of narrative framework upon which we shall now focus.

3. The Narrative Framework of Luke 9:51-18:14

Taylor asserts that the basic material or source of the travel narrative of Luke's Gospel is Q, together with some special Lucan material, which has been set into a narrative framework.[1] In this assertion he is correct. As has been subsequently demonstrated by the work of form criticism, the narrative framework of the Lucan travel narrative is only loosely (and sometimes artificially) attached to the Q and L material which makes up the body of this section of the Third Gospel.[1] The problem with which we are left at the end of Taylor's analysis is the source of the narrative framework into which Q and Luke's special material have been cast. With this question in mind we shall examine the narrative framework of Luke 9:51-18:14 to ascertain its relation to the material of this section of Luke. Then we shall seek to answer the question of the source of the narrative framework which Luke has imposed upon his material.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 159.

The title which is so frequently given to this central section (9:51-18:14) of the Third Gospel--the travel narrative[2]--is indicative of the type of narrative framework which has been imposed on the material by the Third Evangelist. The over-arching narrative framework from 9:51 through 18:14, and even to 19:45, is the journey to Jerusalem.[1] Apart from the references to the journey, this section of the Gospel of Luke would be without a sufficient cord of unity. Luke has utilized the journey motif in an extremely effective manner. Never over-emphasizing the framework, he nevertheless does not allow the reader to forget the end toward which the narrative is moving. The introductory paragraph of the Lucan travel narrative with its emphasis on the ἀναλήμψις and the journey to Jerusalem sets the stage for what is to come in the remainder of the Third Gospel, at least as far as the entry into the temple in Jerusalem and probably as far as the ἀναλήμυψιςin Acts 1:11. This opening paragraph gives a vivid description of the intentions of Jesus as he prepares to move from Galilee to Jerusalem. It also provides insight into the literary intention of the Third Evangelist. The literary motif of the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem is executed by Luke by periodic references to the journey[2] as he relates the discourse and dialogical materials from Q and his special materials. In addition to the journey references which are interspersed throughout this section of the Third Gospel, Luke also masterfully uses temporal and locative connectives which are congenial with the journey motif to provide a more developed framework within the travel narrative. These briefer narrative notices function in various ways to relate materials within the context of the journey to Jerusalem.

---

[1] See especially Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, pp. 246 ff.

[2] Streeter objects to calling this section of the Third Gospel a "travel narrative." He prefers to call it the "Central Section--a title which states a fact but begs no questions."--Four Gospels, p. 203.

---

[1] See Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, pp. 246 ff.; Robinson, The Way of the Lord, p. 51; Conzelmann, pp. 60 ff.

[2] References indicating either destination or movement include Luke 9:51, 57; 10:1, 38; 11:1; 13:10, 22, 33; 14:1, 25; 17:11; 18:35; 19:1, 11, 28, 29, 37, 41, 45.

We shall attempt to trace the Lucan travel narrative in order to ascertain the relationship between the journey motif, which provides the narrative framework, and the materials of which this section of the Third Gospel is composed. We shall also attempt to see how Luke has employed shorter narrative elements in conjunction with the overarching framework so that he might achieve a greater unity throughout the narrative.

In Luke 9:51 we have the first of a series of references to the journey to Jerusalem, a journey which throughout this section of the Gospel we are not allowed to forget, even when actual progress toward the destination is difficult to discern. We are continually aware that Jesus has set his face toward Jerusalem. (Καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς 'Ιερουσαλήμ.) At this point in the narrative we must assume that Jesus is somewhere in

Galilee.[1] He has expressed his intention to go to Jerusalem and has sent messengers before him into the villages of Samaria (Luke 9:52-56).

Luke 9:57-62 is dialogical material which is without a narrative character of its own. The introductory narrative element καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῆ ὁδῷ εἶπέν τις πρὸς αὐτόν connects these verses with the preceding episode. This clause also suggests that the journey has begun and that Jesus and his disciples are on the way to Jerusalem. Furthermore, it provides the framework into which Luke inserts the advice of Jesus to any who would follow him. It is appropriate that this advice should be given at the beginning of the journey. The advice, however, has broader implications for the Christian life as a whole. It seems to be Luke who has connected the advice with the journey framework.[2]

We have already seen that in the account of the sending and the return of the seventy (Luke 10:1-20) the episodic and the discourse materials are closely related.[1] The account is itself basically narrative in nature. Yet it is placed within a greater narrative framework by the simple phrase μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα.

---

[1] He was in Galilee at the last explicit geographical reference (Luke 8:26).

[2] The use of the typically Lucan expressions πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῆ ὁδῷ and εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν are significant. Also the Matthean parallel (Mt. 8:19-22) is without such a setting.

From Luke 10:21-37 there is little or no narrative movement. The discourse material is united by brief narrative elements within the framework that has already been established. In Luke 10:21 ff. Jesus expresses his gratitude ἐν αὐτῆ τῆ ὥρᾳ. The blessing of the disciples is introduced by the phrase καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν (verse 23). Then abruptly Jesus is no longer alone with his disciples, but a lawyer is questioning him in Luke 10:25 ff. (καὶ ἰδοὺ νομικός τις ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτὸν λέγων). It is the lawyer's question (ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον;) which provides the setting for the parable of the Good Samaritan that follows in verses 30-37. The material of this section is, thus, only loosely connected to the over-arching framework. We must assume that Jesus is in conversation with those who accompany him or with whom he has contact while moving toward Jerusalem.

At Luke 10:38 there is again narrative movement and a recurrence of the journey motif with the explicit statement, ἐν δὲ τῶ πορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς κώμην τινά. With the story of Mary and Martha we have once more the inclusion of a narrative episode[1] under an over-arching narrative framework. The episode itself does not provide framework. Rather the episode is connected with the framework in the same loose manner in which we have seen discourse material connected with the narrative framework.

---

[1] See above, p. 72.

In the lengthy segment from Luke 10:38 to 13:22 there is no explicit reference to the journey motif. The Third Evangelist is heavily dependent upon the shorter narrative elements to provide unity for his material. At times a sense of unity is achieved by bringing together materials which have a similarity of content. For example, the setting for the whole of Luke 11:1-13 is provided by the introductory statement of verse 1: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῶ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τοπῶ τινι προσευχόμενον.[2] The fact that Jesus is praying prompts the disciples to ask that he teach them to pray. The Lord's Prayer is given as a model (verses 2-4). The parable of the friend at midnight (verses 5-8) further illustrates the principle of prayer, while verses 9-13 serve to illustrate the concern of God for those who ask of Him. All of this is connected under the affirmation that Jesus was praying at an unspecified place, presumably somewhere along the way to Jerusalem.

---

[1] See above, p. 73.

[2] Note again the typically Lucan use of ἐν τῶ plus an infinitive and the indefinite pronoun used with a noun.

The discourse on the casting out of demons and the return of the evil spirit in Luke 11:14-20 is provided a place in the narrative by the introductory reference to the casting out of a demon in verse 14: καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντες ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός· καὶ ἐθαύμασεν οἱ ὄχλοι.[1]

The connection from the discourse on demons to the blessing of the womb that bore Jesus in verses 27-28 is more problematic. The transition is almost as abrupt as the voice which comes forth from the crowd with the blessing. Taylor suggests that--

> The story of the Woman in the Crowd who cried, "Blessed is the womb," crowns the dialectical victory of Jesus over those who explained His

---

[1] This is true whether verse 14 is a Lucan adaptation of Q alone or whether Luke has been influenced by Mark. See above, p. 68 .

> power by the cry, "By Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, casteth he out devils."[1]

Thus, there is a thematic connection with the preceding discourse. Creed has made a suggestion which by no means excludes the proposal of Taylor. He sees the reference to the mother of Jesus as a variant of the saying on the true relatives of Jesus in Luke 8:19-21 which is in Mark closely connected to the casting out of demons by Beelzebub.[2]

The material from Luke 11:29-13:9 is more loosely connected than any we have seen previously. Short narrative notes string this material together in such a way that it is difficult at times to see even an over-arching narrative framework. At this point (11:29) the narrative framework, which is beginning to suffer from the insertion of so much discourse material, is structurally undergirded by the insertion of the discourse on the generation that seeks a sign. This picks up a motif which was suggested in Luke 11:16: ἕτεροι δὲ πειράζοντες σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐζήτουν παρ' αὐτοῦ. Verses 33-36 follow without any narrative connection with the implication that Jesus is the light that shines and no other sign is needed.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 154.

[2] Says Creed: "We seem to have a variant of the saying on the true kinsfolk of Jesus (Lk. viii.19-21) which Mk. follows closely on the saying concerning 'casting out devils by Beelzebub' (∥ Mt. xii.45,50)."--Creed, p. 162.

With the over-arching framework of the journey to Jerusalem still in the distant background, the narrative note of verses 37-38 (ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι ἐρωτᾷ αὐτὸν φαρισαῖος ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ' αὐτοῦ· εἰσελθῶν δὲ ἀνέπεσεν. ὁ δὲ φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου.) provides a setting for the rebuke of the Pharisees, lawyers, and scribes who are here, as elsewhere in the Gospels, closely associated with one another. Much of the material which has been put into this setting is material which Luke has taken from Q, as may be seen by a comparison with Matthew. The narrative note in verse 45 (ἀποκριθεὶς δέ τις τῶν νομικῶν λέγει αὐτῶν) continues in this same setting. The statement of verses 53-54 (κα' κεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων, ἐνδρεύοντες αὐτὸν θηρεῦσαί τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.) concludes the scene. This summary statement also engenders an awareness of a developing tension between Jesus and the Pharisees. In Luke 12:1 the feeling of tension continues to mount. Chronologically the phrase ἐν οἷς tells us little. However, the statement ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους helps to give the narrative momentum. It also heightens the tension by contrasting the followers of Jesus with the Pharisees. Even in the discourse to the disciples which begins in 12:1 the rebuke of the Pharisees continues, but then fades into a more general discourse. There is a thematic unity with the discourse which is built around the idea of carefree living in the ensuing preparation for the coming Son of Man. The narrative framework is scarcely obvious, with only brief narrative notes being inserted into the discourse: εἶπεν δέ τις ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου αὐτῷ (v. 13); ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ (v. 14); εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς (v. 15); εἶπεν δὲ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων (v. 16); εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ (v. 22); εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος . . . καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος (vv. 41-42); and ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις(v. 54). It is noteworthy that there is an alternation between the limited audience of the disciples (12:1, 22, 41) and the broader audience of the crowds (12:13, 14, 15, 54).

The episode of Pilate's mingling the blood of Galileans with their sacrifice is brought into the discussion at the beginning of chapter 13.[1] This episode is not, however, presented as a narrative. Rather it is merely introduced into the conversation as an example, thereby picking up the theme of judgment from the end of chapter 12. The parable of the fig trees (Luke 13:6-9) is connected to the question of judgment simply by the statement ἔλεγεν δὲ ταύτην τὴν παραβολήν. It is difficult to understand why the parable is included here unless the fig tree is used symbolically to portray the Jewish people who are to be allowed additional time for repentance before the judgment.[1]

---

[1] See above, p. 74, for a discussion of this as a narrative episode.

The over-arching framework of the journey to Jerusalem becomes more obvious in Luke 13:10. The introductory statement ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν introduces a new scene. Movement is, therefore, implicit. Still the relation of the episode of the healing of the woman with a spirit of infirmity is only loosely connected with the over-all framework. The episode seems to function more as a setting to portray the rejection of Jesus by the rulers of the synagogue who are representatives of all the Jewish people. The narrative, thus, turns in such a way as to show, as was evident in the discourse material, the tension between the adversaries of Jesus and his followers.

The two parables of the Kingdom (the mustard seed and the leaven, Luke 13:18-21) are portrayed by Luke so as to convey the idea that Jesus is still in the synagogue.[1] They are subsumed within the dialogue which follows the healing of the woman in the synagogue.

---

[1] Cf. Creed, p. 181.

In Luke 13:22 Luke returns to the motif of the overarching narrative framework of this section of the Third Gospel, the journey to Jerusalem. Here the motif is explicit and its insertion gives the narrative the movement that it is beginning to need after the lengthy section of predominantly discourse material. Verse 22 is over-weighted with words or phrases which imply movement: Καὶ διεπορεύετο κατὰ πολεῖς καὶ κώμας διδάσκων καὶ πορείαν ποιούμενος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. After this brief mention of the journey, discourse material again prevails in Luke 13:23-35. Even in the discourse material, however, the journey motif occurs in verse 33. (πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῆ ἐχομένη πορεύεσθαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἰερουσαλήμ.)

From the beginning of chapter 14 to the end of this section (18:14), the Pharisees play an important role in the discourse with Jesus. This segment of the Third Gospel is introduced by the episode in which Jesus is a guest on the

---

[1] Creed, p. 181.

Sabbath in the home of one of the Pharisees. In this setting a man with dropsy is healed by Jesus, an act which heightens the tension between Jesus and the Pharisees.[1] Luke uses this scene of Jesus as a guest in the home of a Pharisee as the context for a group of sayings, all of which have in common the theme of a feast. The banquet setting and theme are all that hold these verses together as a literary unit.

The narrative note in Luke 14:25 (Συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς) implies a change of scenery, for it is hardly conceivable that crowds of people whould accompany Jesus as an invited guest. While this notice has the effect of conveying movement within the narrative, Luke minimizes this effect by following the parable of the great supper, in which the invited ones did not honor their commitment, with the sayings on the cost of discipleship.[2] The continuation of the same general theme has a greater effect than the notice of a change of scenery. Jesus appears still to be talking to the Pharisees. The topic has merely changed from invitation of discipleship to conditions of discipleship. This impression that Jesus is still conversing with the Pharisees is strengthened by a further reference to them in the narrative note of Luke 15:1-2: ἦσαν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐγγίζοντες πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. καὶ διεγόγγυζον οἵ τε φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες ὅτι οὗτος ἁμαρτωλοὺς προσδέχεται καὶ συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς. This narrative note also provides the setting for what follows through Luke 17:10. There is here a lengthy discourse of Jesus which has been pieced together by the Third Evangelist. At times the sayings of Jesus are addressed to the greater audience as in Luke 15:2-3 (καὶ διεγόγγυζον οἵ τε φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς λεγοντες . . . , εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς.) and Luke 16:14, 15 (ἤκουσαν δὲ ταῦτα πάντα οἱ φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες, ἐξεμυκτήριζον αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.).[1] At other times Jesus speaks only to his disciples as in Luke 16:1 (Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς),17:1 (Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ), and 17:5-6 (καὶ εἶπεν οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ κυρίῳ . . . εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος). This vacillation between audiences has the effect of suggesting movement

---

[1] 1. Creed, p. 188, suggests that this scene is a literary creation of the Third Evangelist.

[2] 2. Creed observes that the gathering of the crowds "answers to the universalistic note of the last parable [the parable of the great supper]."--P. 193.

---

[1] The audience is not described in Luke 15:11. We must assume, therefore, that Jesus is still addressing himself to the wider audience.

on the part of Jesus and his followers even when there is no narrative episode and no mention of the journey in this segment of the travel narrative.[1] Progress on the journey to Jerusalem is suggested even without an explicit description of movement from Luke 13:22 to Luke 17:10.

Again in Luke 17:11 the journey motif comes to the fore with the statement: Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας. The narrative episode which follows is, as others which we have seen,[2] only loosely connected to the narrative framework. It is subsumed under the narrative framework much like the discourse material which precedes and follows it. It does, however, help to give a feeling of genuine narrative movement at a point where such is badly needed.

There is no other reference to the journey to Jerusalem in the remainder of this section which ends at Luke 18:14.[3] Discourse material prevails, with there being once more a vacillation between the wider audience (Luke 17:20--Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, and perhaps also Luke 18:9--εἶπεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶν δίκαιοι καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντας τοὺς λοιποὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην.) and the limited audience of his disciples (Luke 17:22--Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς.). So the lengthy section concludes with a preponderance of discourse material again subsumed under the over-arching shadow of the journey to Jerusalem.

---

[1] There is one implicit reference to movement along the journey in Luke 14:25.

[2] See above, p. 75, for a description of the healing of the ten lepers as a narrative episode.

[3] As noted earlier, the journey to Jerusalem goes on beyond this point in the narrative to Luke 19:27. The division at Luke 18:14 is artificial in that it takes into

As we look back over our analysis of this section of Luke's Gospel, we see two distinct types of narrative elements which help to give a structure to this long section of dialogical and discourse materials. First, there are the recurring references to the journey to Jerusalem which provide the over-arching framework. Second, there are the brief narrative elements which give continuity to the section within this narrative framework.

An analysis of both categories of narrative elements indicates that they are abounding in characteristically Lucan

---

account only the source material used and not the over-all narrative as it now stands. We are, however, following the divisions of Streeter and Taylor.

expressions.[1] The presence of so many expressions which are characteristic of Luke strongly suggests that the narrative elements are the work of the Third Evangelist. While it is true that the presence of expressions characteristic of Luke in the travel narrative is not adverse to the literary hypothesis suggested by Streeter and Taylor, the fact that many of these same expressions occur in sections of the Third Gospel in which Marcan and non-Marcan materials have been combined is also explicable on the theory that the Marcan and non-Marcan material were brought together at one and the same time in the structure of the Third Gospel. The main point for our consideration at present is the observation, based on the distribution of expressions characteristic of Luke, that the narrative framework has been imposed by Luke on his material. We have already seen that the material of the travel narrative is non-Marcan. We must now ask the important question of the source of the central concept of the journey to Jerusalem which Luke has made the narrative framework for this portion of the Third Gospel. In his thorough discussion of the problem of the unity of Luke 9:51-18:14, Taylor fails to raise this question of the source of the narrative form, or framework, into which the Third Evangelist has cast Q and his special material.

---

[1] See above, p. 73, n. 2, to determine the distribution of typically Lucan expressions in these narrative elements; the list in Hawkins was followed.

Let us note three relevant facts: (1) In Luke 9:51-18:14 there are a number of references to the journey to Jerusalem and/or references which imply progress toward an unspecified goal.[1] As we have seen, the references to the journey provide the framework for the whole section. (2) We know that Luke has used Mark at least for parts of his Gospel. (3) There is in fact a journey to Jerusalem in the Marcan narrative. Let us now consider these factors in reverse order.

The fact of the journey in Mark is clear. In Mark 10:1 we have the statement, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. In Mark 10:17 the journey motif recurs: καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδόν. There is explicit reference to the journey to Jerusalem in Mark 10:32: ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῆ ὁδῶ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. In the very next verse Jesus says: ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. The reference to Jericho in Mark 10:46 indicates progress on the journey. In Mark 11:1

---

[1] See above, p. 77, n. 2.

Jesus and his disciples are approaching Jerusalem (καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) and in verse 11 Jesus enters the city (καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα). There is no denying the reality of the journey in Mark.[1]

Furthermore, a noteworthy factor about the way in which Mark has presented the journey to Jerusalem is the placing of teaching material within the journey setting. The reference to the journey in Mark 10:1 is followed by the teaching on marriage and divorce (Mark 10:2-12) and the blessing of the children (Mark 10:13-16). Following the reference to the journey in Mark 10:17 is the story of the rich young man and the discussion of riches and entry into the kingdom of God. After the explicit references to Jerusalem in Mark 10:32 and 33 comes the discussion with James and John and the teaching on true greatness.

It is obvious that there is considerable difference in the journey as presented in Mark and the extensive journey of Luke's Gospel. Yet both the journey motif and its use as a vehicle of Jesus' teaching are common to these two Gospels. If we press for an answer to the question of Luke's source for the motif of a journey, the most obvious suggestion seems to be that he has borrowed it from Mark. Since the motif of a journey is not preserved in what we know of Q or Luke's special material, that Mark is the source of the motif of a journey to Jerusalem seems to be the best solution. If we reject this alternative, and still wish to raise the question of the source of this motif, we are forced into the realm of the unknown and the hypothetical. It appears that Luke has taken the motif which he found in Mark; yet he has used it in a different way. For the most part we shall delay until the following chapter our discussion of how Luke has used his sources. Let us note here, however, that Luke appears to have heightened the motif which he found in Mark and has made this motif the framework for a lengthy section of his Gospel. Furthermore, we see in Mark the placing of teachings of Jesus in the context of the journey. While the teachings in Mark do seem to be more closely related to the episodic narrative than is the case in Luke, the pattern is much the same in the two Gospels. Both have teachings and sayings of Jesus presented in the context of the journey to Jerusalem. Knowing that Luke has used Mark it is not too much to suggest that the Third Evangelist has borrowed this pattern of a combination of the journey motif and teachings of Jesus from Mark. While it is clear that he has expanded both the journey motif and the teaching, he has nevertheless used the same pattern as is found in Mark. The most likely suggestion is that he has borrowed this pattern from Mark. There is no evidence of a narrative framework apart from the journey motif which Luke has borrowed from Mark. We have already noted the absence of a narrative framework in conjunction with the narrative episodes. Portions of the didactic material hang together by virtue of their common content. Yet, in the material from Q and L of which the travel narrative is composed, it is impossible to discern a narrative framework.

---

[1] Ernst Haenchen has recently emphasized "Der Weg Jesu" as an important theme in the Gospel of Mark, beginning with Mark 1:3: Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου. The journey to Jerusalem fits into a pattern which, as has rarely been recognized, is important for Mark. See Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu* ("Sammlung Töpelmann," Zweite Reihe, Bd. 6; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966). See also Conzelmann on the presence of the journey in Mark. He says: "It is not Luke who created the journey motif, for he found it in Mark (more likely than in the special material), but he was the first to develop it into a scheme."--P. 62.

If Luke has employed this pattern from Mark in the composition of Luke 9:51-18:14, it is obvious that there is no place for the hypothesis that he composed this section of his Gospel prior to his acquaintance with Mark. Rather, his acquaintance with and use of Mark can be detected as early as his attempt to bring together Q and his special material. For this section of the Third Gospel the Proto-Luke hypothesis is superfluous. There is little reason to postulate such an unknown as Proto-Luke when the use of that which we can be sure, namely Mark, provides a more solid basis for explaining the structure of the travel narrative of the Third Gospel.

Luke 19:1-27[1]

1. The Question of Marcan Material in Luke 19:1-27

The material of which this section is composed is derived from Luke's special material (verses 1-10) and from Q (verses 11-27). We accept the assertion of Streeter and Taylor that this is another non-Marcan portion of the Third Gospel. However, the brevity of this section hardly provides a basis from which to argue for a connected framework which is earlier than the present structure of the Third Gospel.

2. The Narrative Episodes of Luke 19:1-27

That the story of Zacchaeus is a unit in itself becomes clear in reading the account. The story seems to have been associated originally with Jericho. The fact that

---

[1] Streeter speaks of Luke 19:1-27 as an additional section which differs from the other non-Marcan sections "only in the matter of length."--P. 205. Taylor treats Luke 19:1-28 as a unit so as to include verse 28, which is Lucan. However, verse 28 seems to be an introduction to the section dealing with the entry into Jerusalem.

Luke has altered the setting of the healing of the blind man from εἰς Ἰεριχῶ (Mark 10:46) to ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεριχῶ (Luke 18:35) indicates that the story of Zacchaeus was closely enough connected with Jericho to necessitate Luke's altering his material. Thus both stories, the healing of the blind man and that of Zacchaeus, are related to Jericho in Luke as the former was in Mark and as the latter must have been wherever Luke found it. Although the story of Zacchaeus has the character of a journey story, this story in itself as an isolated episode is not sufficient basis from which to argue for a pre-Lucan journey narrative. Indeed, even Taylor suggests that the episode was chosen by Luke because of its journey character to fit into the journey framework which is independent of the episode itself.[1]

3. The Narrative Framework of Luke 19:1-27

The narrative episode of Zacchaeus is given its setting outside of Jericho, which is just the point at which the Marcan outline (Mark 10:46 ff.) has Jesus. The episode of the healing of the blind man is presented in Mark just as Jesus is leaving Jericho (Mark 10:46--ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ

---

[1] Taylor, p. 93.

Ἰεριχῶ). In Luke Jesus is drawing near to Jericho (Luke 18:35--ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεριχῶ). Creed has suggested that Luke has made this modification in the interest of providing a setting for the story of Zacchaeus.[1] In any case the story of Zacchaeus is given a setting which matches the progress of the Marcan narrative. Knowing that Luke has used Mark, it does not seem too presumptuous to assert that Luke has used the Marcan framework for presenting the episode of Zacchaeus.

Likewise the parable of the pounds has a setting congenial with the Marcan framework, although the parable seems to be from Q and is presented by Matthew in a context after Jesus had arrived in Jerusalem.[2] It appears that in the Lucan position of the parable of the pounds, Luke has given it its place in the Marcan framework by adding the phrase διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἰερουσαλήμ in verse 11. This whole of Luke 19:1-27 is further tied to the Marcan framework in verse 28 with the statement, και εἶπεν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Thereby the parable and the story of Zacchaeus are set into a narrative framework which Luke has borrowed from Mark.

---

[1] Creed, p. 228.

[2] See Matthew 25:14-30.

Luke 19:37-44, 47-48

1. The Question of Marcan Material in Luke 19:37-44, 47-48

These two sections which Taylor attributes to Proto-Luke are so brief and so closely related that they may be considered together. Taylor asserts that while Luke has used the Marcan account of the obtaining of the colt (Mark 11:1-8) in Luke 19:29-36, "he replaces the account of the Approach to Jerusalem . . . by a non-Markan version (Luke 19:36-44), and entirely omits the climax of the whole--the Markan reference to the Entry into the City (. . . Mark 11:11)."[1] On the contrary, the verbal agreement of major phrases[2] in Luke 19:38 and Mark 11:9-10 indicates that Luke has used Mark as a source. Luke has, however, made two major changes in the material which he has borrowed from Mark. First, he has replaced the references to the Davidic kingdom (ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ) with the more innocuous title βασιλεύς . Second ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις has been modified to ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις .[3] Both of these changes reflect Luke's own theological interest rather than the use of a source other than Mark.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 143.

[2] Note the phrase εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίος and ἐν ὑψίστοις .

[3] Cf. Luke 2:14.

Taylor has observed correctly that Luke has omitted the Marcan account of the entry into Jerusalem. It is not the case, however, that he has replaced it with a non-Marcan account. Rather, it seems that Luke has omitted altogether the actual entry into Jerusalem in the interest of having Jesus go directly to the temple. In Luke, Jesus is never portrayed as being in the city until he appears in the temple in Luke 19:45.[1] Furthermore, it is because of this Lucan emphasis that the cleansing seems to take place in Luke on the day of the entry into Jerusalem, rather than on the following day as in Mark.

It is obvious Luke 19:39-44 is non-Marcan. It is not clear, however, whether Luke is using a non-Marcan source in verses 39-40 or has created these verses to fill out the picture and thereby prepare for conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees once Jesus has arrived in Jerusalem.[2] Verses 41-44 appear more definitely to follow a non-Marcan tradition.[3]

---

[1] We shall discuss the reasons for this portrayal below. See pp. 219 f . See also Conzelmann, p. 75.

[2] See Creed, p. 238.

[3] On the other hand, Conzelmann, p. 76, sees no need to assume a source other than Mark.

Let us note, however, that the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem is set in the Marcan framework of the approach to Jerusalem by the note καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν, ἰδὼν πόλιν (verse 41).

The account of the entry into and the cleansing of the temple in Luke 19:45-46 is obviously dependent on Mark 11:15-17.[1] Very closely related to Luke 19:45-46 are verses 47-48. Yet Taylor wishes to attribute these verses to a non-Marcan source. While Luke 19:47-48 is not parallel to Mark 11:18-19, the two have much in common. Both center on the attempt of the leaders of the Jews to destroy Jesus. Furthermore, the two passages have in common the key words οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσ[αι].[2] This verbal agreement is almost too striking to be coincidental when both passages have the same thrust. Taylor has greatly emphasized the generalized statement of Luke 19:47 as indicative that Luke used a separate source. Luke states: ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (verse 47). Taylor asserts that the result of this statement is "to introduce a difference between the two Gospels both as regards the occasion and also the ground of the plot."[1] While it is true that the insertion of this statement by Luke has the effect of weakening the connection between the cleansing of the temple and the plot,[2] Luke may not have intended to separate them so widely as Taylor has suggested. Rather, Luke has simply taken the reference to the temple as the occasion to create the impression of a more lengthy ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem than is indicated in Mark.[3] Nevertheless, Luke seems to have been using Mark in Luke 19:47-48. Yet he has given the story a different slant by interpolating the reference to the daily teaching in the temple.

---

[1] See Taylor, pp. 95 f.

[2] Where Luke has αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι, Mark has πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

2. Narrative Episodes in Luke 19:37-44, 47-48

The elements of dialogue in Luke 19:37-44, 47-48 are closely tied to the narrative portions. The accounts of the entry and the cleansing of the temple are derived from Mark, with Luke having made alterations to support his own interests. Only the statement καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ inserts a narrative element which is strange to the Marcan narrative. As we have already seen, this is not intended to undercut the Marcan narrative, but rather to add an additional emphasis for the sake of giving certain implications for the ministry in Jerusalem. There is no reason to assume that any narrative episode in these verses is derived from a source other than Mark.[1]

---

[1] Taylor, p. 96.

[2] See Creed, p. 242.

[3] See below, p. 215.

3. Narrative Framework in Luke 19:37-44, 47-48

The narrative episodes of these verses are nearly identical with the narrative framework. It is difficult to speak of one apart from the other. We need, therefore, only to add that the narrative framework, like the narrative episodes, is Marcan. Into the Marcan framework Luke has inserted the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem with the words καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν, ἴδων τὴν πολιν ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτήν. Otherwise, we have only the Marcan narrative with minor alteration to express Lucan emphasis. Thus we may also say with reference to this portion of the Third Gospel that it is unnecessary to resort to the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

---

[1] See above, pp. 100 ff.

Luke 21:18, 34-36

Only a brief statement needs to be made about these verses which Streeter attributes to Proto-Luke.[1] Taylor, too, views these verses as non-Marcan.[2] Yet Taylor sees that "Mk. xiii. supplies the ground-plan on which the Lucan Discourse is built."[3] Taylor thus concedes that Streeter's argument that Luke 21:18, 34-36 should be attributed to Proto-Luke is untenable. Indeed, it is difficult to understand why Streeter attempted to argue that these isolated verses belonged to Proto-Luke, for a non-Marcan framework is essential to the Proto-Luke hypothesis. It is difficult to speak of any framework in dealing with isolated verses such as Luke 21:18,34-36.

Luke 22:14-24:53

Our task in analyzing the Lucan Passion narrative is made more difficult by the fact that Marcan and non-Marcan materials are more closely interwoven in this portion of the

---

[1] Streeter, p. 222.

[2] Taylor, pp. 101 ff.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 125.

Third Gospel than in any other section.[1] Whereas it is possible to speak principally of blocks of Marcan and non-Marcan material elsewhere in Luke, alternation between Marcan and non-Marcan material occurs at much shorter intervals in the Passion narrative.

The Lucan Passion narrative has been studied, in whole or in part, by numerous scholars. Among the most important treatments of this section of the Third Gospel are those of A. M. Perry,[2] John Hawkins,[3] Paul Winter,[4] Heinz Schürmann,[5] Friedrich Rehkopf,[6] and Joachim Jeremias.[7]

---

[1] Cf. Creed, "'L' and the Structure of the Lucan Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Exp. T.*, XLVI (1934), 103 f.

[2] A. M. Perry, *The Sources of St. Luke's Passion Narrative* ("Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament," 2nd ser., vol. IV, part 2; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1920).

[3] John Hawkins, "II. Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel: 3. St. Luke's Passion-Narrative considered with reference to the Synoptic Problem," *S. S. P.*, pp. 77-94.

[4] Paul Winter, "The Treatment of His Sources by the Third Evangelist in Luke XXI-XXIV," *Studia Theologica*, VIII (1954), 138-172.

[5] Heinz Schürmann, *Eine Quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlberichtes, Lk. 22,7-38*.

[6] Friedrich Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*.

[7] Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*.

We, too, must examine the Lucan Passion narrative. Our analysis will follow the paradigmatic questions in light of which we have examined the other sections of the Third Gospel attributed to Proto-Luke.

1. The Question of Marcan Material in Luke 22:14-24:53

a. *Luke 22:14-20*. In this widely discussed pericope there are obvious parallels between Luke and Mark. Yet there are also distinct differences which point to the use of a source in addition to Mark, perhaps even to the use of a source other than Mark altogether. A solution to the problem of Luke's source is made all the more difficult by the uncertainty of the text in verses 19b-20. We shall, however, accept the text of Luke 22:14-20 as it stands, including verses 19b-20.[1] The longer text is attested in all the Greek manuscripts except D.[2] Furthermore, both Taylor[3] and Jeremias[4] have noted that the shorter reading ends abruptly with Luke 22:19a (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου). In his version of the Eucharistic words, Luke has followed a tradition which is also reflected in I Corinthians 11.[1]

---

[1] For a thorough discussion of the textual problem in Luke 22:19b-20, see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, pp. 139-159. For the arguments from the point of view of one who accepts the shorter reading, see Taylor, p. 39. See also Paul Winter, in *Studia Theologica*, VIII (1954), 157.

[2] The longer text is attested in P^{75}, ℵ, B, C, K, L, T, W, X, Δ, Θ, Π, Ψ, and others. See *The Greek New Testament*, edited by Kurt Aland *et al*. (New York: American Bible Society, 1966), pp. 302-303.

[3] Taylor, p. 39.

[4] Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, p. 156.

Taylor insists that originally Luke 22:14-18 stood alone as the "narrative of institution."[2] To this account, says Taylor, Luke later added verse 19a from Mark when the Gospel of Luke as we know it was edited. "The interpolation in xxii.19b-20 represents a further stage which St. Luke himself did not take."[3]

We must begin our analysis of the narrative of the institution with the question, What in these verses is Marcan? In verses 14-17 there is little evidence of Luke's use of Mark. We must agree with Taylor that any two accounts of the Last Supper are likely to have some words in common.[4] Schürmann has argued that verse 14 is a Lucan adaptation of Mark 14:17.[5] He has shown that the change from καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης (Mark 14:17) to καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα (Luke 22:14) is a typical change for the sake of improving the Greek. The use of οἱ ἀπόστολοι (Luke) instead of τῶν δώδεκα may be understood as a Lucan alteration.[1] Schürmann cites Luke 6:13 and 11:49 where a form of ἀπόστολος occurs when Luke has used Mark or Q as a source. Aside from these passages there are only three other instances of the use of ἀπόστολος in the Third Gospel. In Luke 9:10 Luke follows Mark 6:30 in using οἱ ἀπόστολοι. Luke 17:5 and 24:10 seem to be the editorial work of Luke. Luke's preference for the use of οἱ ἀπόστολοι to designate the inner circle of twelve followers of Jesus is reflected in the repeated use of the word in the early chapters of Acts.[2]

---

[1] Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 160 ff.

[2] Taylor, pp. 36 ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 39.

[4] Ibid., p. 36.

[5] Schürmann, "Der Paschamahlbericht," Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XIX (1953), 104-110.

Under the weight of the evidence presented by Jeremias[3] and Schürmann,[4] we must concede that the Lucan account of the

---

1. Schürmann, in Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XIX (1953), 109.

2. See Acts 1:2, 26; 2:37, 42, 43; 4:33, 35, 36, 37; 5:2, 12, 18, 29, 40; 6:6; 8:1, 14, and 18.

3. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 89-203. Jeremias believes that Mark has preserved the most original form of the Eucharistic tradition (p. 189).

4. Schürmann, in Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XIX (1953), and Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XX (1955). Schürmann views Luke as preserving the oldest form of the tradition.

words of institution is on the whole dependent on a source other than Mark. Both Jeremias and Schürmann see the two accounts as separate forms which go back to the same tradition but which are derived by separate channels of transmission. It is, indeed, likely that the source employed by Luke represents the liturgical tradition which was familiar to Luke.[1] Jeremias has argued convincingly that the Lucan form with the two cups is true to the understanding of the Last Supper as a Passover meal.[2] If then we accept the Lucan account of the institution as an authentic whole, there is no discrepancy between the Lucan words of institution and the Marcan context which designates the Last Supper as a Passover meal.[3] If we accept the longer form of the text, as we have suggested above and as Jeremias has argued is demanded by the context,[4] it is hardly permissible to take Luke 22:19a as an insertion from Mark as Taylor has suggested.[5] Taylor's main argument for taking verse 19a as an insertion from Mark is contingent on his acceptance of the shorter text (excluding verses 19b-20). He argues that τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου is not an appropriate ending for the words of institution and that they do not serve as a good introduction to verse 21. Our acceptance of the longer reading avoids the difficulty of Taylor's analysis at this point.

---

[1] Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 106-137.

[2] Ibid., pp. 15-88. Compare Taylor, p. 37, who thinks that the Lucan source did not identify the Last Supper with the Passover meal.

[3] See Taylor, p. 37.

[4] Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 152.

[5] Taylor, p. 39.

b. Luke 22:21-23. The fact that Luke has placed the prediction of the betrayal after the narrative of institution rather than before the Supper as it appears in Mark tends to obscure whatever dependence there may be on Mark in these verses.[1] The complexity of the problem is perhaps best demonstrated by the fact that the two most thorough treatments of the Lucan prediction of the betrayal have come to opposite conclusions. Schürmann views Luke 22:21-23 as a Lucan redaction of Mark.[2] Friedrich Rehkopf sees these same verses as being dependent on Luke's special source.[3] Taylor acknowledges the dependence of Luke 22:22 on Mark 14:21a.[1] At the same time Taylor insists that Luke 22:21 and 22 have "practically nothing in common with Mark."[2] While the verbal agreement between Luke 22:21 and Mark 14:18 is limited, there is striking agreement in content between these two verses. In both, the prediction of the betrayal is related to the traitor's presence at the table. The disciples' inquiry in verse 23 as to which of them would betray Jesus has much in common conceptually with Mark 14:19. In both there is concern that the traitor be identified. It is also noteworthy that verse 23 provides both a good conclusion to the prediction of betrayal and a good introduction to the discussion of the disciples in verse 24. The use of Mark in verse 22 and the way in which verses 21 and 23 merge into the adjacent material indicate Luke's redaction and expansion of Mark apart from another source.[3]

---

[1] We shall need to consider the reasons for this transposition later. See below, p. 137.

[2] Schürmann, "Jesu Abschiedsrede," Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XX (1957), 3-20.

[3] Die lukanische Sonderquelle, pp. 7-30.

c. Luke 22:24-27. That Luke recognized the similarity between this scene at the Last Supper and Mark 10:41-45 is probably indicated by his omission of the material of Mark 10:41-45. The verbal agreement between verses 25 and 26a and Mark 10:42-43a is extensive. Yet the comparison made by Luke is between ὁ νεώτερος and ὁ διακονῶν, over against the contrast of διάκονος and δοῦλος in Mark 10:43 and 44. Furthermore, the comparison in Luke 22:27 is between ὁ ἀνακείμενος and ὁ διακονῶν. Were this the only difference we might suspect that Luke had made this alteration in the interest of adapting the Marcan material to the setting of the Last Supper. The differences throughout verses 24-27, however, suggest that Luke has used a source other than Mark, though Mark 10:42-43a may have influenced the present form of Luke 22:25-26a. Indeed, Taylor suggests that verses 25-26a may be an insertion of Marcan material into an otherwise non-Marcan story.[1] The "good connection" between verses 24 and 26b is not, however, so impressive as Taylor suggests.[2] The present connection, including verses 25-26a, is certainly a better one. It is preferable to view verses 24-27 as a non-Marcan account which has been influenced by Marcan material.[3]

---

[1] Taylor, p. 40: "The Markan origin of Luke xxii.22 is hardly open to question."

[2] Ibid., p. 41.

[3] Winter, in Studia Theologica, VIII (1954), 156, views verses 21 and 22 as dependent on Mark 14:18-21, but he thinks that verse 23 is dependent on a source other than Mark.

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 41-42.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 42.

[3] Cf. Creed, p. 267; Schürmann, in *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XX (1957), 63-99; and Winter, in *Studia Theologica*, VIII (1954), 158 f.

d. Luke 22:28-30. Luke is clearly using non-Marcan material in these verses. The agreement between these verses and Matthew 19:28 points toward the use of Q. If this is the case, this is the only place in the Passion narrative where Luke has used material from Q. It is generally recognized that Q did not include an account of the Passion. Luke has, therefore, probably inserted here a saying which is foreign to this context. This observation is supported by the location of the comparable saying before the Passion in Matthew.[1]

e. Luke 22:31-34. In verses 31-33 there is no evidence of Luke's dependence on Mark. Luke seems to have omitted Mark 14:27-28. The most obvious reason for this omission seems to be the reference to Galilee in verse 28, which is foreign to the Lucan presentation of the resurrection appearances in Jerusalem. While the idea of the desertion of Jesus by his disciples is implicit in the Marcan account, it is a general statement whereas the Lucan account deals explicitly with the denial by Simon. The denial by Simon, quite obviously, is not foreign to the Marcan account, for in Mark 14: 29 f. Mark records the denial by Peter. Yet there is nothing in the Marcan account comparable to the testing of Simon in Luke 22:31-33. Schürmann thinks that verses 31-32 are dependent on a special source and are thus more than a Lucan embellishment of Mark.[1] However, he views verse 33 as a Lucan redaction.[2] It is noteworthy that different titles are used in verse 31 (Σίμων) and verse 34 (Πέτρος). However, the fact that Mark 14:37 has these same two titles together in one verse makes it impossible to take this factor as evidence for the combination of different sources in Luke 22:31-34. The idea of verses 31-33 is not foreign to the basic idea of verse 34. It is impossible to be certain whether verses 31-33 are Luke's editorial elaboration or whether they have been derived by Luke from a source. In either case, verses 31-33 are used to expand the idea expressed in verse 34 which has been derived from Mark.

---

[1] Schürmann, in *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XX (1957), 54 ff., sees Luke 22:28-30 as having been early connected to Luke 22:15-20. The use of βασιλεία in verses 16, 18, and 29 is important in his decision.

f. *Luke 22:35-38*. These verses are peculiar to Luke's account of the Last Supper. Their non-Marcan origin is unquestionable.

---

[1] Schürmann, in *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XX (1957), 99-116.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 27 ff.

g. Luke 22:39-46. Taylor has indicated the low percentage of words which Luke shares with Mark in the account of the agony in the garden.[1] He also has noted that "the only continuous passage in common with Mark is found in the closing words: 'Pray, that ye enter not into temptation.'"[2] Furthermore, he observes that Luke has omitted the name Γεθσημεμανί.[3] Thus, Taylor concludes that the Lucan account of the agony in the garden is independent of Mark, except for the clause προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν (Luke 22:46b) which is a Marcan pendant which has been added later. On the other hand, we note that with the exception of verses 43-44 (which, if not interpolations into the text,[4] must certainly be from Luke's special material),[1] every verse in this pericope is loaded with words or phrases which are at least reminiscent of the Marcan account. Verse 40 has the clause προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. Bultmann has suggested that this clause reflects the influence of Mark 14:38.[2] Luke 22:40 may have been affected by the mention of praying in Mark 14:32 (προσεύξωμαι). Ἀπεσπάσθη . . . ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν in verse 41 may simply be a graphic improvement of προελθῶν μικρόν (Mark 14:35). Προσηύχετο appears in both the Marcan and Lucan accounts. Most of Luke 22:42 is also found in Mark 14:36, though in slightly different form. Luke has: πατέρ, εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω. Mark has: ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι· παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ’ οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 43. Luke shares with Mark 30 out of 115 words (26 percent). This includes verses 43-44 which are textually dubious. Exclusive of verses 43-44, the percentage is 34.

[2] Taylor, p. 44.

[3] Ibid. Luke has simply τοῦ τόπου.

[4] The textual problem of Luke 22:43-44 is difficult. These verses are included by the manuscripts ℵ (originally), D, K, L, X, Δ, Θ, Π, and Ψ. They are omitted by P^{75}, B, T, and W. They have also been removed by a corrector in ℵ, but have been restored by a later corrector of this manuscript. Creed, p. 273, suggests that verses 43-44 may have been omitted "for the same doctrinal motive which led St. John entirely to omit the agony and the prayer in the garden." Yet Creed chooses to omit the verses. We shall include these verses because of the difficulty of understanding why they should be added to the text if they were not in the original.

Over against the verbal similarities of the Lucan and Marcan accounts which we have seen, we must place some very important differences. First, in the Lucan account the disciples remain together, whereas in the Marcan version Peter, James, and John go a short way with Jesus before he goes to be alone. Second, in Luke the question τί καθεύδετε; is addressed to all the disciples. Third, the threefold prayer of Jesus and the threefold discovery of the sleeping disciples are omitted by Luke. Therefore, while it appears that Luke has used Mark throughout his account as it stands, he has also made some significant changes. These changes, however, suggest no more than the re-editing of his Marcan source. There is not sufficient change to establish the use of a source other than Mark. We shall discuss later the reasons for the Lucan changes.[1]

---

[1] Novelistic notes such as this are not uncommon in Luke. See Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 282.

[2] Ibid., p. 268.

h. Luke 22:47-53.[2] Taylor has described this section as "another example of a non-Markan source which has received a Markan addition."[3] The Marcan addition of which he speaks is Luke 22:50b, 52b-53a.[4] In these verses the distinct dependence on Mark is too strong to deny. As for the remainder of the Lucan account of the arrest of Jesus, Taylor argues that despite some parallels with Mark, the differences are of such a nature as to lead to the conclusion that the basic source is non-Marcan. First, he cites the greater emphasis which is given to Judas. This, says Taylor, is better explained if the source is non-Marcan, for there has been no recent mention of Judas.[1] We must note, however, that Mark has also found it necessary to identify Judas as εἷς τῶν δώδεκα (Mark 14:43). The Lucan emphasis is not so much greater. Regardless of what source Luke has used, there has been no mention of Judas since Luke 22:3 ff. Second, Taylor notes the lack of a reference in Luke to "swords and staves" and the mention of the fact that the crowd came "from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders."[2] While Taylor's observation is correct in that Luke does not include these items in reporting the arrival of the arresting party, he does report these items within the account of the arrest itself. With a slight modification of the make-up of the party, Luke reports all of this information in verse 52. Whereas Mark has reported the composition of the arresting party and their carrying sticks and stones both directly (Mark 14:43) and indirectly (verse 48), Luke has combined these two statements into one (Luke 22:52). Third, Taylor has observed that Luke does not report the prearranged sign of a kiss as the means of betrayal. Nor does he report that Judas actually kissed Jesus.[1] However, even Taylor admits that all this is implied in the words of Jesus in verse 48: Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως;[2] While these words are peculiar to Luke, the content and context demand the prior statement that Judas drew near φιλῆσαι αὐτόν. The relation of Luke 22:48 to the Marcan note ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν (Mark 14:44) is not difficult to perceive. Taylor notes that the report of the cutting of the ear in Mark is "discordant with what is peculiar in St. Luke's account."[3] Luke adds details not present in Mark--that it is the right ear and that the ear is actually severed. Also, the manner of healing reported in Mark (by touching) is, as Taylor has suggested, strange in the case of a severed ear. Luke at least seems to know a source which gives information in addition to that found in Mark. This source must in some way be related to John 18:10 where it is also the right ear which is severed.[4]

---

[1] See below,pp.228f.

[2] Here we shall follow what appears to be a division between episodes rather than the division of Taylor who discusses Luke 22:47-54a as a unit.

[3] Taylor, p. 45.

[4] Ibid., p. 47. For a similar view see Rehkopf, Der lukanische Sonderquelle, pp. 77 ff.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 45.

[2] Ibid.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 45.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 46.

[4] See Bailey, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John, p. 48.

Our review of Taylor's observations does not point to the use of a non-Marcan source such as Taylor has conjectured. Rather, we have seen that the Marcan source is basic to the narrative as a whole. Luke has enriched the Marcan narrative with details from elsewhere. The account as a whole does not, however, seem to be dependent on a source other than Mark.

i. Luke 22:54-62. We concur with the judgment of Taylor that the Lucan account of the denial of Jesus by Peter is dependent on Mark.[1] Taylor has noted that in these verses not only is the percentage of words common to Luke and Mark high, but also the distribution of these words throughout the narrative is even. Furthermore, says Taylor, "the variations in St. Luke's narrative can in most cases be adequately explained either as inferences from Mark or as editorial modifications."[2] There is no reason to doubt the Marcan origin of the account of Peter's denial of Jesus.

j. Luke 22:63-65. The Lucan account of the mocking of Jesus has very few words in common with Mark. Also, in

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 48 f. The denial by Peter appears to be in a slightly different position in Luke from that in Mark. This is because the trial before the Sanhedrin has been moved by Luke to the next morning, as we shall see below, p. 139.

[2] Taylor, p. 48.

Luke the mocking is done by the men who held Jesus in custody at the house of the high priest, whereas in Mark the maltreatment is attributed to men during the trial. Taylor argues that the disassociation of the mocking from the trial in Luke points to the use of another source. However, the fact that Luke has relocated the trial on the following morning[1] may have made it necessary to disassociate the mocking from the trial. The mocking, then, quite naturally falls during the night at the home of the high priest where Jesus was held in custody. If Luke has used a non-Marcan source for his account of the mocking, we must be able to reach this conclusion on some basis other than its disassociation from the trial. Perhaps this basis is to be found in the lack of verbal agreement with Mark. The few words which Luke does have in common with Mark are basic to the account. Both Luke and Mark have some form of the words περικαλύπτειν and προφητεύειν. While this fact may lead us to suspect the use of Mark, the limited agreement between the two accounts demands caution at this point. That Luke 22:64 has in common with Matthew 26:68 the question τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε; may even indicate limited use of a source common to the First and Third Evangelists. On the other hand, Streeter thinks that the text of Matthew has been assimilated to the text of Luke.[1] We can only say that there is a lack of evidence of direct use of Mark in Luke's account of the mocking.

---

[1] See below, p. 139.

k. Luke 22:66-71. Taylor sees little reason for thinking that Mark is Luke's source for the account of the trial before the Sanhedrin.[2] The only important words which the Lucan account has in common with Mark, says Taylor, are in verses 69 and 71. In these two verses there is extensive agreement with Mark which might be viewed as editorial adaptation of Mark.[3] Taylor prefers to think, however, that the form of verses 69 and 71 is "due less to the editorial use of Mark than to the drift of the Lukan story as a whole."[4] This view assumes a separate Lucan source. More must be said, however, for the case of the dependence of this narrative on Mark. This is especially true of verse 71 where the parallel with Mark is so close as to suggest strongly that Luke has used Mark. Elsewhere in this pericope the case is not so strong for the use of Mark. Verse 66 is a verse of transition which was necessary because Luke has moved the nocturnal trial before the Sanhedrin to the following morning. A transition from the mocking to the trial is therefore necessary. In this verse two important words from Mark occur--ἀρχιερεῖς and συνέδριον. The clause εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός (verse 67), though no longer in interrogative form, may be based on Mark 14:61. Oscar Cullmann has argued that ὁ χριστός is in Luke, as well as in Matthew, a title subject to being misconstrued in a political sense.[1] To such a question Luke has Jesus give an evasive answer (verse 68) and adds the statement about ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (verse 69; compare Mark 14:62).[2] This statement redirects the question of his examiners so that they ask συ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ, a title which does not yield itself to a political interpretation. Thus, verse 70 seems to be a modification of the Marcan question σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱός τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ (Mark 14:61). There is little reason to assume a non-Marcan source in Luke 22:66-71.[3]

---

[1] Streeter, pp. 325 ff.

[2] Taylor, p. 50.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[4] *Ibid.*

---

1. Oscar Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament*, translated by Shirley Guthrie and Charles Hall (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), p. 120.

2. Helmut Flender, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*, translated by Isle and Reginald Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 44 ff. Hereafter cited as Flender.

3. Winter, in *Studia Theologica*, VIII (1954), 162-165. suggests that Luke 22:67-71 is the work of a "post-evangelic

1. Luke 23:1-25. In dealing with this section of Luke's Gospel, we may begin by isolating the account of Jesus before Herod. These verses (Luke 23:6-16) show no indication of dependence on Mark. We are left, therefore, with the problem of determining the dependence of Luke on Mark for his account of the trial before Pilate which is in Luke interrupted by the appearance before Herod. The trial before Pilate is, thus, in two portions, Luke 23:1-5 and 18-25.[1]

Taylor has observed that in Luke 23:1-5 and 18-25 there are only 51 words, 26.5 percent, common to Mark. Of these 51 words common to Luke and Mark, "27 are accounted for by proper names, the verb 'to crucify,' and instances of the use of δέ and the definite article."[2] Taylor further notes that of the remaining 24 words common to Luke and Mark, 16 of them occur in Luke 23:3. Thus, there remain only eight words

---

interpolator." Winter states (p. 163): ". . . The ensuing verses 67-71 present such a number of grammatical, stylistic and doctrinal incongruities in relation to the preceding account of the Evangelist that the difference in authorship is obvious."

[1] Verse 17 is probably an interpolation based on Mark 15:6 or Matthew 27:15. See Alfred Plummer, Gospel According to St. Luke ("International Critical Commentary"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 525.

[2] Taylor, p. 52.

common to Luke and Mark which are scattered in verses 18-25.[1]

Let us analyze the Lucan account of the trial before Pilate. In verses 1-5, apart from verse three which Taylor assumes to be a Marcan addition, there are as Taylor has correctly observed no verbal agreements with Mark except the proper name Πιλᾶτος (twice), the definite article, and δέ. But does the account hold together without verse three? Does not the story itself demand either what Luke has incorporated from Mark or something comparable to it? It is not likely that Pilate would have given the judgment recorded in verse four without having heard from the prisoner. If verses 1-2 and 4-5 once stood as part of a connected whole, why has Luke not used that which originally united them rather than borrowing the connecting link from Mark?

In verses 18-25 our calculation of the number of words which Luke and Mark have in common differs from that of Taylor.[2] Apart from proper names, the verb σταυροῦν, δέ, and the definite article, there are 15 words common to Luke and Mark (as compared with Taylor's 8).[3] Furthermore,

---

[1] Taylor, p. 52.

[2] See above.

[3] These include ἀν]έκα[γον, ἀπόλυσον, στάσιν, φόνον, πάλιν, αὐτοῖς, αὐτούς, τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν, αὐτόν, ἀπέλυσεν, παρέδωκεν, and αὐτ[ῶν].

Taylor's exclusions are too extensive. In the category of words excluded are 17 words in verses 18-25. This brings the total words in common to Luke and Mark for these verses to 32 of 103 words, or almost one-third. While this is still not a high percentage of words in common, the distribution of the words in common throughout verses 18-25 is impressive. Mark and Luke agree in their use of infrequently used words such as στάσις and φόνον. Both have the question τί γάρ ἐποίησεν κακόν; In view of the evidence that we have cited for the dependence on Mark in the account of the trial before Pilate and the absence of evidence for a connected source other than Mark, it seems probable that Luke 23:18-25 are Luke's recasting of Marcan material.[1]

m. *Luke 23:26-32*. In the account of the journey to the cross, the weeping of the women and others who followed Jesus, and his words to the daughters of Jerusalem (verses 27-31) are peculiar to Luke and give no evidence of dependence on Mark. There is, however, strong evidence for the use of Mark in verse 26 in the account of Simon of Cyrene being pressed into service to carry the cross of Jesus. Eleven of nineteen words in verse 26 are common to Luke and Mark.

---

[1] With only a brief discussion of the problem, Winter, in *Studia Theologica*, VIII (1954), 165 f., has assigned Luke 23:4-5, 18-25 to the hand of the same interpolator who is responsible, in his opinion, for Luke 22:66-71.

A more difficult question is the dependence of Luke on Mark in verse 32. The reference to the two κακοῦργοι being led away with Jesus has no connection with the material in verses 27-31. There is, however, a parallel in content with Mark 15:27. Yet verbal agreement between Luke 23:32 and Mark 15:27 is limited to four words, καὶ and δύο σὺν αὐτῷ. Κακοῦργοι is used in Luke rather than ληστάς which is in Mark. Yet, even in Luke 23:33, where the case for Luke's use of Mark is stronger, Luke uses κακούργους. In any case, verse 32 is editorially adapted to make the transition from the words to the daughters of Jerusalem back to the main flow of the narrative. It is, therefore, probably not necessary to attempt to discern a source for verse 32 other than the source which underlies verse 33.

n. Luke 23:33-49. Taylor has attributed the account of the crucifixion to a non-Marcan source, noting that there have been several Marcan insertions. These he identifies as Luke 23:34b, 38, and 44-45. He sees the remainder of Luke 23:33-49 as owing nothing to the Marcan account of the crucifixion.[1] Taylor cites eight features of the Marcan story which have no parallel in Luke.[1] Of these, three may be explained easily by Luke's tendency to delete foreign words in his source. First, Luke has omitted Γολγαθᾶν and has simply used the translation Κρανίον in verse 33. Second, he has omitted the Aramaic words ἐλωῒ ἐλωῒ λαμὰ σαβαχθάνι. And third, he has deleted the reference to Elijah in Mark 15:35 ff. which is introduced in the first place because of a misunderstanding of the Aramaic cry of Jesus. It is only natural that if Luke is to delete the cry he should also omit that which can be explained only in light of the cry.

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 55-59.

Further, Luke has omitted the reference to the mocking of the passers-by in Mark 15:29 f. It is noteworthy that their jeer οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, σῶσον σεαυτόν . . . contains a reference to the destruction of the Temple which is comparable to the reference to the Temple in Mark 14:57 which Luke has also omitted. Thus, it would appear that the omission of the jeer of the passers-by is an intentional omission on Luke's part. We need to note, however, that the jeering which Luke attributes to the soldiers in verses 36-37 includes the same jeer which

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 55-56.

Mark attributed to those passing by: σῶσον σεαυτόν (Luke 23:37; Mark 15:30).

Three other features of the Marcan account which have been omitted are of less significance. The mention that it was ὥρα τρίτη (Mark 15:25) and that he was offered wine (Mark 15:23) are merely details. The omission of some of the words τῶν γραμματέων (Luke 23:35 has ἄρχοντες) is not decisive when the words which are retained are in close verbal agreement with Mark 15:31 f. except for the change in titles for Jesus which is not unexpected in Luke. Luke is not opposed to speaking of Jesus as God's elect or even as Son of God.

The final feature of Mark which Taylor has identified as being absent from the Lucan account is the statement that both of those who were crucified with Jesus reproached him (Mark 15:32b). Luke has instead inserted special material concerning the jeering of only one of those crucified with Jesus and the penitence of the other (Luke 23:39-43). This seems to be simply an addition to the story which demanded deleting a portion of a verse from Mark (Mark 15:32b).

As a whole the objections which Taylor has raised are not so formidable as their enumeration would suggest. Furthermore, there is Marcan material scattered liberally throughout the Lucan account of the crucifixion, except in verses 34a, 39-43, and possibly 48-49. In his account of the crucifixion Luke appears to have used Mark as a basic source. He has made several significant modifications. He has also enriched the Marcan story with material peculiar to the Third Gospel. Yet Marcan material is basic to the story as a whole.

o. Luke 23:50-56. It is almost beyond doubt that Luke used Mark as the basis of this account of the burial of Christ. In verses 50-54 the degree of verbal agreement with Mark is high.[1] Taylor sees these verses as "St. Mark's story abbreviated and furnished with a few explanatory notes."[2] We should observe that verse 54 is a slight modification of Mark 15:42 which has been transposed to the end of the account to facilitate the transition to verses 55-56 which Luke has added. The transfer of Mark 15:42 from before to after the burial has created the time gap after the burial which makes it possible for the women to prepare spices for anointing the body of Jesus.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 59, reports that 44.6 percent of the words in Luke are common to Mark in these verses.

[2] *Ibid*.

p. Luke 24:1-11.[1] Taylor argues that the account of the empty tomb in Luke is totally independent of Mark. The most striking difference between the Marcan and Lucan accounts is the focus on Galilee. Indeed, this is a formidable difference. Yet the narrative as a whole follows Mark closely. There is extensive verbal agreement. The phrase φέρουσαι ἅ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα (Luke 24:1) seems to be a Lucan embellishment in keeping with Luke 23:55-56. In verse three the clause δὲ οὐχ εὗρον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου 'Ιησοῦ is also a Lucan addition, but it is an addition which is implied by the Marcan account. In verse four there are two men as compared to the one man in Mark. In view of the tendency of Luke to provide a dual witness in many situations this change should not surprise us.[2] Neither should this entrancement of the men by the addition of the phrase ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ.[3] However, the presence of comparable details in John 20:12 may indicate Luke's dependence on a source for these details.[4] This brings us to the important difference of the place of the appearance of Jesus. As we shall see, Luke has unquestionably used non-Marcan material in this account of the appearance of Jesus. This non-Marcan material depicts the appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem rather than in Galilee as is suggested in Mark. Yet we have seen that in the account of the empty tomb Luke appears to be following Mark. How has he dealt with the discrepancy in his sources? Here Luke has utilized the Marcan reference to Galilee; but instead of applying it to the locale of the appearance, he has used Galilee as the scene of Jesus' foretelling his betrayal, crucifixion, and resurrection. (Luke 24:6--ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὢν ἐν τῆ Γαλιλαίᾳ.)[1] By making this transfer, Luke has bridged the gap between Mark and his non-Marcan material. In this way he has been able to bring together materials which conflicted in reporting the location of the appearance of the resurrected Lord.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 61. Verse 12 appears to be a later addition.

[2] Compare Acts 1:10 where there are ἄνδρες δύο. See Creed, p. 293. See also Morgenthaler, Die lukanische Geschichtschreibung als Zeugnis, I, 98-181.

[3] See again Acts 1:10.

[4] Bailey, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John, pp. 83 ff.

Luke has also used the reference to Galilee and the recall of the words of Jesus as a means of dispelling the fear of the women. As a result the women are no longer speechless. Rather, they return to report to the apostles and the others the news: ἠγέρθη. It is as messengers of this kerygma that the names of the women are reported, rather than as bearers of spices to the tomb as in Mark. Thus the women who play such an important role as witnesses in Luke also become witnesses of the fact that Christ is risen.

---

[1] Cf. R. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* ("The Bampton Lectures, 1934"; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), p. 166.

q. Luke 24:12-53. There is no evidence of Marcan material in these final verses of the Third Gospel. Luke has used his special material to add to the Marcan narrative which ends with the empty tomb.

In view of our analysis, then, it appears that Streeter and Taylor have underestimated the extent of Luke's use of Mark in the Passion narrative. We have seen evidence of the use of Mark in the following portions of Luke 22:14-24:53: Luke 22:14, 21-23, 34, 39-46, 47-53, 54-62, 66-71; 23:1-5, 18-25, 26, 33-38, 44-49, 50-56; 24:1-11. The dependence of Luke on Mark is greater, in terms of the amount of Marcan material, than Streeter and Taylor have allowed.

2. Narrative Episodes in Luke 22:14-24:53

The Passion as a whole is essentially a single narrative episode. It is difficult to speak of isolated events which have little relation to one another as we have done in our analysis of previous sections attributed to

Proto-Luke. Still it will be helpful to distinguish events which can be singled out within the Passion narrative of Luke.

The Last Supper is such an episode. Though the reporting of it as such is different in Luke from that in Mark, the occurrence of the Supper as a Passover meal is the same in Luke as in Mark. The reporting of it as a narrative event remains much the same in Luke, although the Third Evangelist does elaborate upon the discourse of the evening by additions, some from another source and some which seem to be redactional.

The basic events from the agony in the Garden to the discovery of the empty tomb are essentially the same in Luke as in Mark. Even according to Taylor, each event of Luke in this span has its parallel in Mark, with the one exception of the trial before Herod (Luke 23:7-16).[1] The agony on Mt. Olivet (Luke 22:39-46), the betrayal and arrest (Luke 22:47-53), the denial by Peter (Luke 22:54-62), the mocking by the soldiers (Luke 22:63-65), the trial before the Sanhedrin (Luke 22:66-71), the trial before Pilate (Luke 23:1-5, 18-25), the journey to the cross (Luke 23:26-32), the crucifixion (Luke 23:33-49), the burial (Luke 23:50-56), and the visit to the empty tomb (Luke 24:1-11) all have a parallel in Mark. At times Luke has altered the Marcan episodes. He has added non-Marcan material at places. But the basic events of the Lucan narrative are the same as the events of Mark. Only the episode of the appearance of Jesus before Herod (Luke 23:6-16) is without parallel in Mark in the span from the Last Supper to the point at which the Marcan narrative ends. Beyond the empty tomb with which Mark ends, Luke has three episodes which come from his special material: the Emmaus story (Luke 24:13-35), the appearance of the risen Christ in Jerusalem (Luke 24:36-49), and the departure of Jesus (Luke 24:50-53).

---

[1] Taylor, p. 34.

3. The Narrative Framework of Luke 22:14-24:53

To speak of the framework of the Last Supper it is necessary to begin with Luke 22:1-13, which follows Mark in reporting the preparation for the Last Supper as the preparation for the Passover meal. Beginning with the Last Supper as a Passover meal, the Lucan account basically follows the Marcan narrative until the report of the empty tomb. We have seen that Luke has rewritten and rearranged some of the material which he took from Mark. He has also added material not found in Mark. Taylor interprets these facts as proof that Luke was using a connected non-Marcan source.[1] But is this necessarily the case? In view of the fact that we have already seen that the extent of Marcan material in the Lucan Passion narrative is greater than Taylor wishes to admit, if we can show that there are reasons other than the use of a connected non-Marcan source for Luke's altering the order of the Marcan narrative at a few points, it will not be necessary to resort to the Proto-Luke hypothesis as an explanation for the Lucan narrative as it stands.

The first change in the Marcan order is the location of the prediction of the betrayal by Judas after the Last Supper (Luke 22:21-23) rather than before the meal as it is in Mark 14:18-21. B. S. Easton has suggested that this transposition provides a better connection for the Lucan narrative.[2] The questioning about which of the disciples would betray Jesus in Luke 22:23 provides an appropriate introduction for the dispute which follows in verses 24 ff.[3]

---

1. Taylor, pp. 71 f.

2. B. S. Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1926), p. 323.

3. Friedrich Hauck, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage von Walter Grundmann, "Theologischer Handlommentar zum Neuen Testament," III; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt [1961]), p. 400.

As a whole, Luke 22:24-38 is a Lucan addition. This addition does not, however, alter the Marcan order. Rather, the discourse extends the Supper scene beyond the Marcan portrayal. We must note, however, that the reference to the denial by Peter is expressed by Luke within the discussion at the Supper, rather than after the departure to Mt. Olivet as in Mark 14:29 f. The change of the time of the prediction of Peter's denial to the setting of the Supper is congruous with Luke's attempt to prefigure the Church in the gathered communion at the Last Supper. In this setting Peter becomes the type of one who is to be tempted,[1] indeed, of one who will yield to temptation and yet be reinstated. It is noteworthy that Luke did not find it necessary to change the Marcan order to make this emphasis.

In connection with Christ's appearance before the Sanhedrin and the related events, the Lucan order differs more from the Marcan order than in any other portion of the Passion narrative. Mark reports the appearance before the Sanhedrin (Mark 14:53-64), followed by the mocking of Jesus by the soldiers (Mark 14:65) and the denial by Peter (Mark 14:66-72). Mark 15:1 portrays a second meeting of the Sanhedrin. Luke, on the other hand, has Jesus arrive at the house of the high priest (Luke 22:54) where he is held in custody until morning (Luke 22:66--καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα . . . .). During the interim while Jesus was being held, Luke reports the denial by Peter (Luke 22:54b-62) and the mocking of the soldiers (Luke 22: 63-65). The appearance before the Sanhedrin follows on the next morning (Luke 22:66-71). We need not resort to a non-Marcan source to explain the difference in the Lucan order. Rather the modification may be attributed to what Creed has called "intelligent criticism of Mark"[1] concerning the legal process.[2] If a nocturnal setting is improbable--as seems to be the case--then it is quite probable that Luke has attempted to reconstruct as best he could the events from Jesus' arrest to the following morning. This required the telescoping of the two meetings of the Sanhedrin into one, which Luke chose to place on the morning after the arrest of Jesus. The denial by Peter and the mocking of the soldiers took place during the night while Jesus was being held in custody.

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 199.

---

[1] Creed, p. 277.

[2] For a discussion of the legal problems involved in the trial of Jesus, see William R. Wilson, "The Trial of Jesus: A Judicial, Literary and Historical Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1960).

We have already seen in our brief examination of the narrative episodes of the Lucan Passion narrative that, with the exception of the trial before Herod (Luke 23:6-16) and the post-resurrection stories, the episodes of the Lucan Passion narrative are basically those of the Marcan narrative.

In review, other than those of Mark, there are no episodes which supply a framework for the Lucan narrative. The framework of the words of institution (Luke 22:15-20) is provided by the Marcan material in Luke 22:1-13. The saying on true greatness (Luke 22:24-27) reflects a table setting. It appears, however, to have been adapted by Luke to the table setting which has been borrowed from Mark. Verses 28-30 provide no framework of their own. The words of Jesus in verses 31-33 seem to have been added as a complement to the idea expressed in Luke 22:34, which was derived from Mark. The Lucan account of the mocking of Jesus (Luke 22:63-65) is an isolated event. Whereas the trial before Herod is the most extensive episode of the Lucan Passion narrative for which Luke is not dependent on Mark, it has no framework of its own. Likewise, the story of the penitent thief is dependent on the Marcan framework. Finally, as we shall see,[1] the material of Luke 24:13-53 is of diverse character and has been united by Luke. Its unity is found in the motif of the fulfillment of prophecy which has been imposed on it by Luke. We have already seen that to make this addition, Luke found it necessary to alter the way in which Mark referred to Galilee.[1] Furthermore, Luke 24:13-53 is but an extension of a narrative which up to Luke 24:11 has Mark as its Grundschrift. Thus, non-Marcan portions of the Lucan Passion narrative do not have the unity of a separate narrative which Streeter and Taylor suggested. Luke's framework is the Marcan narrative. Although Luke has made some alterations in the Marcan narrative, these changes are intentional alterations. There is little evidence that the non-Marcan material provides anything like a framework for the Lucan Passion narrative. Despite the changes which Luke has made, the basic framework of the Lucan Passion narrative is that of the Marcan Passion narrative.

---

[1] See below, p. 235.

Summary

As we look back over our analysis of the portions of the Third Gospel which Taylor and Streeter have attributed to

---

[1] See above, p. 133.

Proto-Luke, we need to make the following observations: (1) With few exceptions, we agree with Streeter and Taylor that these sections are composed of non-Marcan material. In the Passion narrative, however, they have greatly underestimated the amount of Marcan material. (2) There are important points in these sections of the Gospel of Luke which reflect a consciousness of the Marcan framework, even when non-Marcan material has been used. Streeter and Taylor have taken into consideration only the criterion of direct use of source material in their endeavor to determine the literary dependence of Luke. Consideration of the additional criterion of use of the Marcan framework and the conceptions or motifs it embodies reveals dependence on Mark at many points in the "non-Marcan" sections of the Third Gospel. (3) Luke's awareness of the Marcan framework and the use of it in the basic structure of his gospel make it unnecessary to resort to the Proto-Luke hypothesis as an explanation of the early stage of the composition of the Third Gospel. This is especially true since we know that Luke has used Mark for at least some portions of his Gospel. Unless we can assume a common tradition of the order of the ministry of Jesus, for which there is certainly no unambiguous evidence, we must acknowledge Luke's use of Mark in the early stages of the composition of the Third Gospel. The great discrepancy between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel in the presentation of the ministry of Jesus hardly allows us to assume such a common tradition. We are indeed on highly hypothetical grounds when we attempt to find such a common tradition of the ministry of Jesus in Q as the work of Streeter and Taylor implies, for Q has been reworked by Matthew and Luke and in the process has already been adapted to the Marcan framework. We are on much safer grounds to assume no more than the commonly accepted view that Q consisted primarily of teachings and sayings of Jesus.

Our examination of the sections which Streeter and Taylor have attributed to Proto-Luke has shown the arguments for Proto-Luke to be less than compelling. In Luke 3:1-4:30 the evidence for Proto-Luke is perhaps more convincing than in any other section. Yet even here the evidence for Proto-Luke is ambiguous since there are indications of the use of Mark at crucial points in the narrative. There is a mixture of Marcan and non-Marcan material in Luke 5:1-11, with almost no evidence to support the Proto-Luke hypothesis. In Luke 6:12-8:3 there is only limited use of Mark. The Marcan material, however, provides what setting there is for the whole of this section. The use of the Marcan framework in the lengthy section of Luke 9:51-18:14 is decisive. Luke

19:1-27 also reflects the use of the Marcan framework. The brief section of Luke 19:37-44, 47-48 reflects both a mixture of Marcan and non-Marcan material and a knowledge of the Marcan framework. Finally, in the Passion narrative Taylor has underestimated the amount of Marcan material used by Luke. Also, nearly all of the episodes of the Lucan Passion narrative have a parallel in Mark so that it is difficult to speak of a narrative framework other than that provided by Mark. This is especially true in light of the fact that the peculiarly Lucan material does not provide a framework of its own.

We have not seen compelling evidence which points to a stage in the development of the Gospel of Luke between Q and L as sources and the Third Gospel in its present form. Rather the extensive dependence on the Marcan framework, even when non-Marcan material has been used, suggests that the Proto-Luke hypothesis is unnecessary to explain the origin of the Gospel of Luke and the literary method of the Third Evangelist.

In view of our criticisms of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, it is our responsibility to examine the alternative explanation of the origin of the Gospel of Luke and the literary method of the Third Evangelist--namely, that Luke has used Mark as his Grundschrift, but has done so with some degree of freedom. We must attempt to explain why Luke has used so much non-Marcan material, if he has used Mark as his Grundschrift. How do the large blocks of non-Marcan material fit into the over-all literary structure of the Third Gospel as it now stands?[1] To these questions we shall address ourselves in the following chapter.

---

[1] One of the limitations of the work of Streeter and Taylor is the failure to look at the over-all structure of the Gospel as it now stands. They have focused too closely on the smaller units, emphasizing the source of specific portions without standing back enough to see the over-all structure.

freedom. We must attempt to explain why Luke has used so much non-Marcan material, if he has used Mark as his *Grundschrift*. How do the large blocks of non-Marcan material fit into the over-all literary structure of the Third Gospel as it now stands?[1] To these questions we shall address ourselves in the following chapter.

---

[1] One of the limitations of the work of Streeter and Taylor is the failure to look at the over-all structure of the Gospel as it now stands. They have focused too closely on the smaller units, emphasizing the source of specific portions without standing back enough to see the over-all structure.

Chapter III

AN ALTERNATIVE TO PROTO-LUKE

The basic alternative to the Proto-Luke hypothesis is to consider the Third Gospel the work of an evangelist who, while using Mark as his framework and guide, has felt free to adjust, rearrange, add, and delete materials in order to convey his own perspective. Recent criticism of the Third Gospel has emphasized the role of the Third Evangelist as a redactor who has given expression to his own theological interests. The _redaktionsgeschichtliche_ method has been applied to the Third Gospel in an attempt to uncover the specifically Lucan interests. Of course, this is most easily accomplished where we can be somewhat sure of the source which Luke has employed, as, for example, when he has used Mark or Q.[1]

---

[1] W. Barnes Tatum, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke i-ii and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," _N. T. S._, XIII (1967), 185, n. 5, observes that "in his attempt to uncover the Third

Having seen in the previous chapter the limitations of the Proto-Luke hypothesis as an explanation for the present form of the Third Gospel, we shall now look at the alternative possibility that Luke has used the Gospel of Mark as his _Grundschrift_, but has taken the liberty to alter, add, and delete in order to convey his own theological interests. Our examination cannot be limited to the portions of the Third Gospel in which the sources are certain. Each segment of the Gospel of Luke must be examined to see how and why Luke has used his material. Why has he altered Mark? Can we ascertain why he has added non-Marcan material? Where themes and ideas transcend the boundaries of sources and appear to be representative of the Gospel (and Acts) as a whole, it is reasonable to assume that they reflect the work of the Third Evangelist and are related to his over-all purpose in communicating the Gospel. We shall examine each section of the Third Gospel with the possibility of viewing it in this manner.

Our analysis of the Third Gospel is by no means a commentary as such, though a good commentary on the Third Gospel is badly needed. Rather, our comments are intended to

---

Evangelist's peculiar theological stance, Conzelmann rightly concentrates upon those sections of the Lucan Gospel which preserve St. Luke's redaction of his Marcan source."

describe the Gospel of Luke as a literary unit in which Marcan and non-Marcan materials have been brought together. We shall attempt to indicate where Lucan motifs and emphases transcend the boundaries of Marcan and non-Marcan material. We shall seek to ascertain why Luke has made additions and omissions and has altered the material which he has taken from Mark. Our analysis in this chapter will follow the basic divisions of the Third Gospel: Luke 1-2; 3:1-4:30; 4:31-9:50; 9:51-19:27; and 19:28-24:53.

Luke 1-2

The Third Evangelist, like Matthew, prefaces the narrative of the ministry of Jesus with an account of his origin. The proponents of Proto-Luke, however, do not understand Luke 1-2 to have been a part of Proto-Luke.[1] In our attempt to understand the Third Gospel as it now stands we must attempt to ascertain why the Third Evangelist has added the material of Luke 1-2.[2] The most thorough work applying the redaktionsgeschichtliche method to the Third Gospel is that of Hans Conzelmann.[1] The basic premise of his analysis of Luke is that the Third Evangelist, no longer expecting an immediate end of history, has reinterpreted salvation history for the Church of his day. He has divided history into three distinct epochs: (1) the epoch of Israel, (2) the epoch of Jesus' ministry, and (3) the epoch of the Church.[2] Though Conzelmann himself seems to have missed the full impact of the introductory chapters of Luke,[3] the significance of Luke 1-2 is best seen in light of Conzelmann's thesis of the three epochs. H. W. Oliver,[4] Paul Minear,[5] and W. Barnes Tatum[6] have seen more clearly than Conzelmann the relation of Luke 1-2 to the remainder of the Third Gospel in light of the division of the history of salvation into three epochs.[1] They acknowledge with Conzelmann that Luke 1-2 is different from the remainder of the Gospel. This difference actually supports the distinction which Luke wishes to portray between the epoch of Israel and the epoch of Jesus' ministry.[2] Oliver, Minear, and Tatum have been able to see beyond the discrepancies between Luke 1-2 and the remainder of the Gospel, and therefore they observe much that these introductory chapters have in common with it. Oliver has emphasized (1) the relation between Jesus and world history (cf. Luke 2:1-2; 3:1-2; and numerous other references to the Roman administration); (2) Jesus and Jerusalem[3] (here the presentation in the Temple connects Jesus and Jerusalem, whereas for Matthew there is no association between the birth of Jesus and Jerusalem); (3) Jesus and the salvation of the Gentiles (see especially Luke 2:30-32); and (4) Jesus and his identity (Luke 2:11 is the crux interpretum; see also Luke 1:30-32 and 2:9-11).[1]

---

[1] Taylor, p. 165.

[2] Luke's primary purpose appears to be quite different from that of Matthew, who is more concerned with the question of who Jesus is and from whence he came. See below, p. 151, n. 1.

---

[1] The Theology of St. Luke.

[2] Ibid., p. 16.

[3] Ibid., p. 172: "The introductory chapters of the Gospel present a special problem. It is strange that the characteristic features they contain do not occur again either in the Gospel or in Acts. In certain passages there is direct contradiction, as for example the analogy between the Baptist and Jesus, which is emphasized in the early chapters, but deliberately avoided in the rest of the Gospel . . . ."

[4] Harold H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," N. T. S., X (1964), 202-226.

[5] Paul Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 111-130.

[6] Tatum, N. T. S., XIII (1967), 184-195. Oliver, Minear, and Tatum have noted Conzelmann's failure to relate these introductory chapters to the remainder of the Gospel.

---

[1] This correctly implies our acceptance of Conzelmann's basic thesis, though we shall occasionally question his interpretation of specific points.

[2] Perhaps the overuse of Semitisms in Luke 1-2 is a means of characterizing the epoch of Israel. A treatment of the problem of the various sources and language of the sources for these chapters is, however, beyond the scope of our task. For a summary of recent literature on the problem see Oliver, in _N_. _T_. _S_., X (1964), 205-215, and R. McLean Wilson, "Some Recent Studies of the Lucan Infancy Narrative," _Studia Evangelica_, edited by Kurt Aland _et_ _al_. (_Texte_ _und_ _Untersuchungen_, LXXIII; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1959), pp. 235-253.

[3] For the importance of Jerusalem in Luke see René

Minear analyzes the Lucan birth stories and concludes that "the stories are thoroughly Lucan and are fully congenial in mood and motivation to his perspective as a whole."[2] Minear's work emphasizes characteristically Lucan words and phrases, style, and theological motifs. Minear, in contrast to Oliver and Tatum, is unwilling to accept Conzelmann's basic perspective for viewing Luke. He feels that it is only by ignoring the birth stories that Conzelmann is able to establish his thesis of Luke's threefold division of salvation history.[3]

Laurentin, Structure et Theologie de Luc I-II (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957), p. 103.

[1] Oliver, in N. T. S., X (1964), 219-223. Tatum, in N. T. S., XIII (1967), 195, tends to minimize the importance of Luke 1-2 so far as the intention to establish the identity of Jesus is concerned. Luke is not concerned to answer the question of who Jesus is and from whence he comes. Tatum says: "Luke i-ii, therefore, play a role in the Lucan writings which differs considerably from the role Matthew i-ii play in the First Gospel . . . . The First Evangelist uses the tradition in his first two chapters to answer two questions about Jesus--Who? and From Where?"

[2] Studies in Luke-Acts, p. 112.

[3] Ibid., p. 121.

Tatum sees the motif of the Spirit as being of unusual significance in connecting Luke 1-2 with the remainder of the Gospel and Acts.[1] The motif of the Spirit is reflected in Luke 1:15 (πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κολίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ); 1:35 (πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι); 1:41 (καὶ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου ἡ Ἐλισαβετ); 1:67 (Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου); 1:80a (τὸ δὲ παιδίον ηὔξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι); and 2:25b, 26a, 27a (καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου . . . καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν). The Spirit is related to both John the Baptist and Jesus in such a way that the two appear to have much in common. There is, however, a difference. Tatum observes that "on the one hand, the Spirit relates itself to John as the dynamic Spirit of Prophecy. On the other hand, the Spirit relates itself to Jesus as the

---

[1] Tatum, in N. T. S., XIII (1967), 184-195. For the widely accepted view that the Spirit plays an important role in Luke see Conzelmann, pp. 173-184; G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Luke," Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, edited by D. E. Nineham (London: Blackwell, 1957), pp. 159-200, and "The Lucan Portrait of Christ," N. T. S., II (1956), 166-175; and Eduard Schweizer, "Spirit of God," Bible Key Words, vol. III, translated by A. E. Harvey from Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. IX (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 36-54.

divine creative-power."[1] The difference between John and Jesus is more striking than the similarity. John is προφήτης ὑψίστου (Luke 1:76). Jesus is υἱός ὑψίστου (Luke 1:32).

Moreover, Tatum suggests that Luke has used the birth stories to characterize the period before the ministry of Jesus as the epoch of Israel[2] in which the spirit of prophecy is rampant. After these introductory chapters the creative spirit as manifested in Jesus is dominant. During the ministry of Jesus the Spirit relates primarily, if not only, to Jesus.[3] In the characterization of the epoch of Israel in Luke 1-2, the various references reflect the idea of Israel as the people of God. Tatum has observed:

> Within this overarching theological framework stand a multitude of references to the different individuals and various traditions that chequered God's long history of dealings with his chosen people: Abraham (i.55,73), Moses (ii.22), Aaron (i.5), David (i.27,32,69; ii.4,11), Elijah (i.17), the fathers (i.72), the prophets (i.70), the Nazarite movement (i.15), the priestly tradition (i.5,8; . . .), scribal interpretation (ii.46f), the monarchy (the mention of David; and i.5), and the messianic hope

---

[1] Tatum, in *N*. *T*. *S*., XIII (1967), 188.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 189.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 191. See Luke 3:16, 22; 4:1, 18; 10:21; 11:13; 12:10, 12; and 24:49.

> (which pervades the whole; as i.32f; ii.11, 25-6, 29f.,38).[1]

The term 'Ισραήλ appears seven times in these two chapters (1:16, 54, 68, 80; 2:25, 32, 35). The word λάος occurs four times. Jesus is identified by his involvement in the epoch of Israel. In this sense, Oliver has rightly emphasized that Luke 1-2 does establish the identity of Jesus. He is born in the epoch of Israel. He participates in salvation history. It is his identification with Israel that prepares the way for "the middle of time," the epoch of his ministry.[2] Thus the introductory chapters of the Third Gospel have an important function in the over-all purpose of the Third Evangelist.

---

[1] Tatum, in N. T. S., XIII (1967), 194 f. See also Minear, Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 127 ff. Tatum also notes that "whatever the reason for the literary character, Luke i-ii are couched in Semitic idiom. The Septuagint-like Greek of the two chapters stands in sharp contrast to the elegant Greek wording and syntax of the preface (i.1-4).

"Thus, the Semitic subject-matter and phraseology of Luke i-ii are not accidental to but supporting the salvation history concern of the Third Evangelist."--P. 195.

[2] Conzelmann, p. 206, observes that John the Baptist is not for Luke, as for Mark and Matthew, the forerunner who is himself a sign of the arrival of the kingdom. Rather, Luke makes a sharp break between John and the arrival of the new epoch. (See Luke 16:16.) Thus, it is important that Jesus is identified in terms of the epoch of John so that he can provide a bridge between the two epochs, for John cannot be identified by his relation to "the middle of time."

They connect the epoch of Jesus with the preceding epoch and identify his person in terms of the epoch of Israel. Thereby the way is prepared for the advent of the ministry of Jesus in Luke 3, the point at which Mark begins his Gospel. Though the proponents of the Proto-Luke hypothesis do not understand Luke 1-2 to have been a part of Proto-Luke, it has been necessary for us to demonstrate the place of these chapters in Luke's over-all presentation of the Gospel. In this analysis of Luke 1-2 we have attempted to see the place of these chapters in the present structure of the Gospel of Luke as a whole. The acceptance of this present structure makes the Proto-Luke hypothesis unnecessary.

Luke 3:1-4:30

Streeter has deemed this section of Luke to be fundamental for the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Not only does he see this section as providing an appropriate beginning for a gospel-like document, but it is also significant, says Streeter, that Luke should begin the first draft of his Gospel with non-Marcan material.[1] Great emphasis is placed on the fact that the genealogy of Luke follows what would have been the first mention of Jesus in the hypothetical Proto-Luke.[1]

---

[1] Streeter, pp. 205 ff.; Taylor, p. 76.

A primary objection must be raised. This section of the Third Gospel is more Marcan than Streeter and Taylor admit.[2] Without disputing the fact that there is much material in Luke 3:1-4:30 which is undoubtedly from Q and L, we need to focus upon the more important issue of why Luke has added this non-Marcan material and how he has adapted the Marcan material.

Even if Luke 3:1-6 is what might well be an appropriate beginning for a Gospel, this does not mean that it was ever previously used or intended in this way. The series of synchronisms of verses 1-2 may just as reasonably apply to the ministry of John.[3] If Conzelmann is correct in his designation of the three epochs in the structure of Luke-Acts,[4] it is very appropriate that a more thorough chronological note be given here at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, which coincides with his baptism by John. In order to accomplish this emphasis and not to interrupt the story of Jesus' baptism, Luke has placed this series of synchronisms at the beginning of the account of John's ministry.

---

[1] Luke 3:21.

[2] See above, pp. 38 ff.

[3] Maurice Goguel, "Luke and Mark: With a Discussion of Streeter's Theory," H. T. R., XXVI (1933), 10.

[4] See above, p. 149. Flender, p. 122, sees the epochs overlapping chronologically. He states, however, that "the difficulty is solved if the difference between John and Jesus is one of quality rather than of time."

In Luke 3:3 the realm of John's ministry is referred to as πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ 'Ιορδάνου. This is to be seen over against the account in Mark 1:5 where there is reference to Jerusalem. This difference in Luke is probably due not to a difference in source, but rather to the clear demarcation by Luke of the spheres of activity of John and Jesus.[1] John's ministry is restricted to the regions of Jordan, while Jesus carries out his ministry in Judea and Galilee. Thus John and

---

William C. Robinson, Jr., feels that Conzelmann has overemphasized the separation between the ministry of John and the ministry of Jesus. He sees little reason to put them in separate epochs. "The competition between the Baptists and the Christians is sufficient to explain what Luke did."--*The Way of the Lord*, p. 9. Hereafter cited as Robinson.

In the Fourth Gospel there is a similar attempt to make a distinction between John and Jesus. In John 1:19 ff. the Fourth Evangelist also avoids identifying John with Elijah. In the Gospel of John it seems to be more clearly a matter of subordinating John to Jesus. Cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S. P. C. K., 1962), p. 142.

[1] Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 19 f.

Jesus are placed in different geographical settings to emphasize their separate ministries.[1]

Despite the special Lucan features of the material in Luke 3:1-6, there is substantial agreement of context between this segment and Mark 1:2-6. In Luke 3:2b-4 there is even significant verbal agreement. In Luke, as in Matthew, the Old Testament quotation is taken only from Isaiah 40. This correction may have well been made independently by both writers without assuming a source other than Mark.[2]

In Luke 3:7-18 Luke is undoubtedly using material derived from Q and L. He draws on these sources for the content of the preaching of John. It is, nevertheless, significant that even in this segment Luke appears to be dependent on Mark for the setting of these words.[3]

More important is the question of the purpose of the preaching of John. The content of John's preaching further relates him to the epoch of Israel. The warning of the wrath to come is prophetic in nature.[1] The emphasis on Abraham in verse eight further relates John to the epoch of Israel. Thus the preaching helps to define John in terms of the old epoch.[2] This is, however, not the full picture of the preaching of the Baptist. As his preaching proceeds the element of expectancy is heightened, and the passage concludes with his messianic preaching (Luke 3:15-18). Here, in contrast to Conzelmann's view, the Baptist assumes the role of a forerunner, a herald who announces the coming of Jesus.[3] Yet John does not participate in the eschatological event: αὐτὸς [Ἰησοῦς] ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί (Luke 3:16). John simply proclaims the approach of the new epoch.[4]

---

[1] At this point Robinson, p. 6, again disagrees with Conzelmann. He sees "nothing against which Luke needed to exert his effort." The fact is, however, that whatever its source, the geographical division is consistent with the dominant scheme of Luke-Acts.

[2] It is interesting that Luke quotes an expanded portion of Isaiah 40 including verses 3, 4, and 5b.

[3] Compare Luke 3:7 and Mark 1:5.

---

[1] Keck, *R. Exp.*, LXIV (1967), 471, points out that John's "Scripture-like work attests to the prophetic nature of the Baptist." Yet, he does not actually fulfill scripture.

[2] Note that the agreement between Luke and Matthew reflects Luke's faithfulness to his source at this point.

[3] See Conzelmann, pp. 22 ff. Conzelmann has perhaps overstated his case about John not being a forerunner. Likewise, Robinson has overstated his criticism in rebuttal of Conzelmann. See Robinson, pp. 3 ff.

[4] Keck, *R. Exp.*, LXIV (1967), 471. In terms of literary structure, Flender, p. 22, sees the preaching of John as providing a parallel with the preaching of Jesus with which this section of the Gospel ends (Luke 4:16-30).

The account of John's imprisonment in Luke 3:19-20 seems out of place where it stands. The contrast with Mark is striking. The difference, however, is probably not due to the use of a source other than Mark, but rather to the execution of the theme of the separation of the epochs of John and Jesus. Luke wishes to remove John from the scene before the beginning of the ministry of Jesus which commences with his baptism.[1] Thus the epoch of John and the epoch of Jesus' ministry are separated chronologically as well as geographically and in terms of quality. The separation is emphasized by the fact that John is not mentioned in the scene of Jesus' baptism. Rather, the account of Jesus' baptism is in the passive voice without an agent being expressed.[2] John is thereby not allowed to participate in the epoch of the ministry of Jesus, which begins with his baptism. John's importance is wholly within the epoch of Israel.

The genealogy of Luke belongs to the material which is peculiar to the Third Gospel and is clearly independent of Matthew. The basic problem which arises with reference to the Lucan genealogy is the reason for its being placed at this point in the Gospel narrative (Luke 3:23-38). Streeter has suggested that this is the natural place for the genealogy, for it follows immediately the introduction of Jesus into the story as presented by Proto-Luke.[1] This argument is, however, not convincing as proof of the existence of Proto-Luke, but can be used only as a supportive argument. Perhaps a more convincing argument for the placement of the genealogy, without assuming the existence of Proto-Luke, is implicit, though not developed, in Conzelmann's thesis of the epochs of salvation history. The baptism of Jesus marks the beginning of his ministry and, thus, the beginning of the new epoch, "the middle of time." It seems appropriate at the very beginning of this epoch that the identity of Jesus be established, and the Lucan genealogy serves this end.

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 21.

[2] Compare the accounts of the baptism in Matthew 3:13 ff. and Mark 1:9.

The movement from baptism to genealogy is quite natural, if, as suggested above,[2] we accept the reading ἐγώ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε in verse 22. Though there is some difficulty in reconciling the understanding of Jesus' becoming the Son of God and the tradition of the Virgin Birth, we must

---

1. Streeter, p. 209; Taylor, p. 47.

2. See above, p. 43 .

remember that in both, Jesus is begotten by the Spirit.[1] Perhaps the tension reflects a difference in Luke's sources and his own understanding. The tension between the two views of sonship must here remain basically unsolved.[2] The picture of Jesus as the Son of God by virtue of his bearing the Spirit of God is, however, the dominant one in the Gospel as a whole. This is obvious in the story of the temptation which follows, where, having established who Jesus is, Luke returns to the Marcan order.

In contrast to the Matthean genealogy, Luke further establishes the sonship of Jesus by his Adamic descent. This also supports a primary interest of Luke--namely, that Jesus Christ is the Savior for all mankind.

The beginning of the story of the temptation connects it with affirmation of Jesus' sonship. He is described as πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (Luke 4:1).[3] This is followed by the clause καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Thus, Luke emphasizes the presence of the Spirit to a degree unparalleled in Mark. Throughout the account of the temptation the title Son of God, which has been established by the account of the baptism and the genealogy, is very important. By the insertion of additional materials Luke has heightened the importance of the title.

---

[1] See Luke 1:34 and 3:22. Tatum, _N_. _T_. _S_., XIII (1967), 192, finds it helpful to speak of the creative Spirit by which Jesus was conceived and the messianic Spirit which was bestowed on Jesus at his baptism.

[2] Keck, _R_. _Exp_., LXIV (1967), 474, asserts that "how he [Luke] reconciled the understanding of the Son of God with the birth narrative is what needs clarifying."

[3] Keck, in _ibid_., p. 475, n. 41, writes thus: "It is clear that for Luke, endowment with the Spirit per se is not

In Luke 4:14 the Third Evangelist continues his use of the Marcan material to control the direction of the narrative. The movement of Jesus into Galilee seems to be dependent on Mark 1:14b. The reason for Jesus' going into Galilee is, however, different in Luke. The implication of Mark at this point is that Jesus left the area of Judea because of the arrest of John. Since for reasons already stated[1] Luke has told of John's imprisonment in Luke 3:19-20, the Third Evangelist relates the journey into Galilee directly to the

---

the distinctive thing about Jesus for he uses the phrase esphasta pneumatos agion (or its equivalent) also of the prophetic figures (John, Zechariah, Simeon; 1:15, 41; 2:25, 27) and of the apostles (e.g., Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 11:14)." Tatum, N. T. S., XIII (1967), 186 ff., has made a meaningful distinction between the Spirit of prophecy which is bestowed on those in the epoch of Israel (John, Zechariah, Simeon) and the messianic Spirit with which Jesus alone is endowed during "the middle of time."

[1] See above, p. 160.

story of the temptation. From the wilderness Jesus goes directly to Galilee.[1] For Luke it is a return to Galilee, a place which has not been mentioned in Luke in connection with Jesus up to this point. Thus, a return to Galilee is intelligible only in light of Luke's use of Mark and the awareness that in Mark 1:9 Jesus is said to have come from Nazareth of Galilee in order to be baptized by John.[2]

The content of Jesus' preaching as reported in Mark 1:15 is deleted by Luke. In its place is the widely-discussed account of the rejection at Nazareth.[3] Though the account of the rejection at Nazareth is dependent on the Marcan sequence,[4] the account itself is probably dependent on a non-Marcan source.[5] Yet, as it stands in the Third Gospel, the account of the rejection is thoroughly Lucan. We must assume, therefore, that Luke is responsible for both the present place and form of the rejection story.[1] The account of the rejection at Nazareth stands as a frontispiece for the whole of the ministry of Jesus. The impact of this pericope must be seen in terms of the plan and purpose of the Third Gospel as a whole. Even Streeter, who views this account as having been taken directly from Luke's source, sees this opening incident of Jesus' ministry as "a story which the author evidently regards as symbolising in little the whole course of Israel's rejection of Christ and His religion."[2]

---

[1] 'Υπέστρεψεν . . . εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, Luke 4:14.

[2] Luke has omitted the reference to Jesus' coming from Galilee to John. This would have made Jesus appear to be subservient to John.

[3] See above, p. 47 .

[4] For example, the plea for Jesus to preform miracles in Luke 4:23 implies a knowledge of the Galilean ministry of the early chapters of Mark and of Mark 1:28 and 39 in particular. The use of the verb ἐρεῖτε looks ahead to events, but this seems to be the perspective of what Anderson has called "a contrived introductory sermon."--In Interpretation, XVIII (1964), 273.

[5] See above, p. 48 .

In the Lucan account of the rejection, Jesus comes as the one endowed and empowered with the Spirit (καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ 'Ιησοῦς ἐν τῆ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος). In Luke 4:18 it is he to whom the words of Isaiah apply: πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ. In the close of the pericope, Jesus escapes from those who wish to kill him by an act which is obviously possible only for one who is endowed with the Spirit. Luke presents this opening episode of Jesus' ministry with an emphasis on Jesus' special endowment by the Spirit. His special mission is

---

1. Cf. Keck, in R. Exp., LXIV (1967), 477.

2. Streeter, p. 207.

possible only because he has been endowed with the Spirit. Furthermore, this emphasis makes it more obvious that Jesus alone is the possessor of the Spirit, as is true throughout the epoch of his ministry.[1]

As one endowed with the Spirit, Jesus is the one who is able to fulfill that which has been written in scripture.[2] Thus he can say σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν (Luke 4:21).[3] It is he who performs the messianic mission to the poor, the captive, the blind, and the oppressed. Combined with the fulfillment motif is the idea of the rejection of Jesus by those to whom he is preaching, those of his home town.[4] The rejection is expressed in verbal form in

---

[1] See above, p. 153.

[2] For the importance of the fulfillment of prophecy motif in Luke see Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," (Beihefte 21, *Z. N. W.*; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 165-186. Hereafter cited as Schubert.

[3] For Conzelmann the temporal aspect of σήμερον is very significant for the demarcation of the period of Jesus in redemptive history. Σήμερον in Luke 4:21 is "already a date in history," the unrepeatable event of the ministry of Jesus. See Conzelmann, p. 36. For a criticism of Conzelmann on this point, see Minear, *Studies in Luke-Acts*, p. 123.

[4] The reason for the rejection is not clear within the pericope. The reaction of the audience seems to vary. For a discussion of the problems involved, see Anderson, in *Interpretation*, XVIII (1964), 266 ff.; Keck, in *R. Exp.*, LXIV (1967), 478 ff.; and Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the*

Luke 4:24: οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῆ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. It is expressed in action in the rejection scene in verses 29-30. The rejection at Nazareth foreshadows the general rejection with which Jesus is confronted throughout his ministry from Nazareth to Calvary.

The rejection points to still another major motif of Luke, that of universalism. The rejection of Jesus is followed by the proclamation of the deeds of Elijah and Elisha outside of Israel.[1] Concern for those outside Israel is important for Luke. Though the ministry of Jesus in the "middle of time" is restricted to Galilee and Judea, his acceptance at Capernaum, by Zacchaeus, and by the penitent thief on the cross prepares the way for his acceptance outside of Israel, which is the major theme in Acts.[2] By pointing to this delayed fulfillment in a more complete sense, Luke has overridden the total failure of Jesus in the Marcan account and points to

---

Nations, translated by S. H. Hooke (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1958), pp. 44 ff. The fact of, not the reasons for, rejection is our primary concern.

[1] The identification of the work of Jesus with the work of the prophets Elijah and Elisha tends, in contrast with Mark and Matthew, to identify Jesus as a prophet. See Keck, in *R*. *Exp*., LXIV (1967), 481.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 482.

a "happy ending."[1] This "success motif" is implicit in the statement of verse 30: αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.

Luke 3:1-4:30 in its present form can be explained in light of Luke's own theological interests and motifs. Though Luke has used Q and material peculiar to the Third Gospel, in addition to the Marcan material, it is unnecessary to resort to the Proto-Luke hypothesis to account for the present form of this section of the Gospel of Luke.

Luke 4:31-9:50

This section of Luke's Gospel deals with the Galilean ministry of Jesus. It includes both Marcan and non-Marcan material. We must, however, look at this section as a whole. The importance of this portion of Jesus' ministry lies largely in the fact that his witnesses gather around him.[2] The witnesses, especially the disciples and the women, play an important role in Luke-Acts as a whole. The disciples are those who are able to bear witness to him ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνελήμφθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν (Acts 1:22). The importance of the women as witnesses is evident by their presence throughout the Gospel (see Luke 8:1-3, 23:49, 55, 56; 24:10). Moreover, in Acts they are present with the disciples (Acts 1:14). For Luke the ministry in Galilee is an important basis for all that follows. Without this period and the witnesses which stem from it, there would not be sufficient continuity between the epoch of Jesus' ministry and the epoch of the Church.

---

[1] Anderson, in Interpretation, XVIII (1964), 271 f.

[2] Robinson, pp. 56-61; Goguel, in H. T. R., XXVI (1933), 38.

In the Galilean ministry as a whole, Luke seems to follow the Marcan framework and order.[1] There are, however, sufficient additions and omissions. We shall attempt to see how Luke has developed this section of the Gospel and how this section fits into the whole of his literary plan.

The account of the rejection at Nazareth serves as a direct introduction to the Galilean ministry as well as the ministry as a whole. Having been cast out of Nazareth, Jesus goes immediately to Capernaum, πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας (Luke 4:31). In having Jesus go directly to Capernaum, Luke picks up the beginning of Jesus' ministry as it is portrayed by Mark 1:21 ff.

---

[1] See above, pp. 64 ff.

In Luke 4:31-44 the Third Evangelist follows Mark closely. Jesus is in the synagogue in Capernaum where he heals the man with the spirit of an unclean demon. Then follows the healing of Simon's mother-in-law and the more general description of the healings at sunset. These are grounds for the recognition of Jesus. Though in Mark he is recognized by the demon, in Luke Jesus is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 4:41). Jesus then departs from Capernaum.

In the account of Jesus' departure from Capernaum and his praying εἰς ἔρημον τόπον there are two noteworthy changes in Mark. (1) Whereas Mark relates καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμον καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ (Mark 1:36), Luke has καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπεζήτουν αὐτόν. The most obvious reason for this change is that in Luke Simon and the others have not at this point been designated as followers of Jesus. Simon is therefore not to be singled out as such. It is also characteristic of Luke to have the crowds follow Jesus. (2) Luke makes more explicit Jesus' reason for leaving Capernaum. He has strengthened the Marcan expression of purpose (ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον) in order to indicate necessity: εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην. When seen in terms of Luke's repeated use of δεῖ with reference to various aspects of the ministry of Jesus and the fulfillment motif,[1] this change seems to be more than a linguistic improvement of Mark.[2]

The transitional clause καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς ᾿Ιουδαίας in Luke 4:44 presents a problem for the Galilean ministry. Conzelmann feels that ᾿Ιουδαίας is the original reading.[3] The reference here does not, says Conzelmann, reflect a misunderstanding of Palestinian geography, but rather shows the importance of Judea for Luke in portraying the ministry of Jesus. "'Galilee' fits in with the plan of Mark and Matthew, but not with Luke's . . . . This can be seen from the two passages vii,17 and xxiii,5 which prove that in this section the original reading is

---

[1] See Conzelmann, p. 40.

[2] For the extensive use of δεῖ by Luke see Robert Morgenthaler, _Statistik des Neutestamentliche Wortschatzes_ (Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958), p. 86. See also W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, _A Concordance to the Greek Testament_ (London: T. and T. Clark, 1899), pp. 185 f. Moulton and Geden cite forty-two instances of the use of δεῖ in Luke-Acts, compared with six cases in Mark. There is, however, in Mark a sense of the necessity for what happens in the course of Jesus' ministry. Luke has at least systematized this necessity and related it to the fulfillment of prophecy motif in close connection with his use of δεῖ.

[3] Conzelmann's choice of ᾿Ιουδαίας as the original reading is not usual. Compare the recent edition of _The Greek New Testament_, by Kurt Aland _et al._, p. 219.

Judea."[1] Though Conzelmann's observation may help us to see that 'Ιουδαίας is consistent with other Lucan usage, he has not convincingly shown why 'Ιουδαία has such importance for Luke. True, it has a significance of its own for the latter part of the Gospel. But what is its significance at 4:44? Robinson cites evidence for Luke's use of 'Ιουδαία in the wider sense to mean all Palestine as well as in the narrower sense of Judea proper.[2] The problem is greater than Conzelmann has indicated. His solution is questionable in light of Luke's apparent inconsistency in using 'Ιουδαία.

The account of Jesus' departure from Galilee portrays Jesus praying. While this is taken directly from Mark, the fact that it is placed where it is appears to be significant for Luke. The result is to show Jesus praying just prior to the call of Simon, James, and John. Though Luke frequently reports Jesus praying, it is noteworthy that the fact of prayer rather than the content of the prayer is usually emphasized.[3]

---

1. Conzelmann, pp. 40 f.

2. Robinson, p. 46; Creed, p. 73. See Luke 1:5; 6:17; 7:17; 23:5; and Acts 10:37, where 'Ιουδαία is used to indicate the whole of Palestine. Luke 1:65; 2:4; 3:1; 5:7; and 21:21 indicate 'Ιουδαία in the narrower sense.

3. Cf. Luke 5:1; 6:2; 9:18, 28; and 11:1. The prayer

The account of the miraculous draught of fish and the summons to Peter has replaced Mark 1:16-20.[1] Why has Luke delayed to this point in his Gospel that which he appears to have regarded as a parallel to Mark 1:16-20? Conzelmann has suggested that the reason lies in the Lucan pattern of presenting deed before word.[2] Thus the call cannot come directly after the rejection at Nazareth, which would seem to be the natural point in the narrative. The events in Capernaum provide a backdrop for the miraculous deeds of Jesus. Even within the pericope of the miraculous catch and call, the miraculous catch is an immediate deed which is then followed by the call. It is not by accident that in this pericope Luke has drawn together what were originally diverse elements.[3] Thus Luke gives authentication to the call in his own peculiar way. Conzelmann observes that--

> The style of the call is very different from Mark. It follows upon a miracle; whilst Mark bases it on the ἐξουσία expressed in the call itself. Whereas

---

on Mt. Olivet is an exception. See Keck, in *R*. *Exp*., LXIV (1967), 473.

[1] See above, p. 55 .

[2] Conzelmann, pp. 41 ff.

[3] See above, pp. 53 ff.

> in Mark the idea of the creative word appears, in Luke the mighty deed and the word of the Kingdom are two separate factors. In Mark the call comes at the beginning as a part of the eschatological preliminary, but in Luke it has to be preceded by a miraculous demonstration.[1]

Luke 5:12-6:19 is one of the lengthy sections of the Third Gospel which has been taken almost totally from Mark with few changes. With the exception of occasional words and phrases which have been omitted, all the material of Mark 1:40-3:19 is included in this section of Luke. In this section Luke is faithful to the Marcan order until the account of the call of the twelve and the healing of the multitudes (Luke 6:12-19). In reporting these two episodes, Luke has reversed the Marcan order. Upon first examination this transposition seems to violate the "deed-word" pattern of Luke. We might expect the miraculous deed to precede the call of the twelve. A more thorough examination of this section of the Third Gospel indicates, however, that Luke has made use of the "deed-word" pattern on a broader scale. The effect of this transposition is that the miraculous event of the healing of

---

1. Conzelmann, pp. 41 f. Luke's preference for the "deed-word" pattern may also be seen in Acts. The pattern is overtly stated in Acts 1:1. There are, of course, many occasions for preaching in Acts which are not accompanied by miraculous deeds. However, where there are miraculous deeds, they precede the proclamation. See Acts 2:1 ff.; 8:26 ff.; 10:1 ff.; and 16:25 ff.

the multitudes occurs just prior to the words of Jesus in the Sermon on the Plain.[1]

Another important feature of the Lucan presentation of this segment of the Gospel is the relation of the mountain to the plain. The mountain is a place of revelation. This is true even in Mark.[2] In Luke, however, the mountain experience is something which is not shared by others, except by the apostles on special occasions. Jesus is portrayed on the mountain in prayer.[3] He then chooses his apostles from among a wider circle of followers.[4] Together with his apostles Jesus descends to the plain. This is the scene of his encounter with the people, first in a deed which expresses his power (the healing of the multitudes) and then in the words of the Sermon on the Plain. The significance of the setting is appreciated when seen in contrast to the Matthean account where the teaching is on the mountain.

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 37, notes that in Matthew the miraculous events follow the Sermon on the Mountain.

[2] "Even in Mark 'the mountain' is a place of revelation. Its symbolical significance is increased still more by Luke. . . . It is the mythical place to which 'the people' cannot come . . . . The people remain behind when Jesus ascends to the mountain alone or with his disciples. . . . It has become the type of the place of prayer and heavenly proclamation and therefore plays a special part in the story of the Passion, such as Luke did not find in his sources. Consequently the plain also attains a special character as the place of meeting with the people."--Conzelmann, p. 44.

[3] Note again the prayer without an expression of content.

[4] It is not clear whether the apostles are on the top of the mountain or not. Jesus seems to be alone in prayer (Luke 6:12).

In the Lucan presentation of the beatitudes, the linkage of the beatitudes with four parallel woes (Luke 6:24-26) provides a typically Lucan pattern. Inasmuch as the contrast with the Matthean presentation indicates that no such woes were in Q, we must assume that the placement of these woes is the work of Luke. As they are presented, the woes provide what Flender calls an example of "antithetical comparison" such as is seen elsewhere in the Third Gospel.[1]

In chapter seven, two incidents are reported in which Jesus performs miraculous acts--the healing of the centurion's servant (Luke 7:1-10) and the raising of the widow's son at Nain (Luke 7:11-17). These accounts are followed by the questions from the disciples of John. The subsequent answer by Jesus is based on what he has done: πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλετε, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (Luke 7:22).

---

[1] Flender, pp. 27-35.

The phrase νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται relates especially to the immediately preceding acts of Jesus. This provides a further example of the "deed-word" pattern in the work of Luke. The response by Jesus also relates to the introduction of his ministry in Luke 4:18. The role of Jesus in carrying out his mission is contrasted with that of the Baptist in Luke 7:24 ff.[1] In verses 33 and 34 the emphasis on eating with sinners prepares the way for the account of Jesus' eating with a Pharisee. The account of Jesus' being annointed by the woman in the house of the Pharisees once more shows the acceptance of Jesus by one who we might anticipate would not accept him. The contrast between the Pharisees and the woman who was a sinner is impressive.

Luke 8:1-3 provides a summary and a transition which links non-Marcan with Marcan material. The summary is of special significance. It tells of Jesus' mission in typical terms--κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. The deeds of Jesus are reported: καὶ γυναῖκές τινες αἷ ἦσαν τεθραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν . Perhaps most important in the light of the whole of the Gospel is the attestation of the gathering in Galilee of witnesses who will play an important role in the development of Luke-Acts (οἱ δώδεκα, Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή, 'Ιωάννα, Σουσάννα καὶ ἕτεραι πολλαί). In Mark the Galilean women do not appear until Mark 15:40. Luke has introduced them early so that they may become authentic witnesses of each stage of Jesus' ministry.[1] The emphasis on this motif helps to give unity to the Gospel as a whole.

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 25, states that "the tension between the tradition and the adaptation of it can be seen in Luke vii.18-35. Verses 28-30 presumably contain the author's interpretation, although perhaps influenced by the source. In the tradition John was more than a prophet; now he becomes the greatest prophet. This agrees with xvi.16."

Conzelmann has over-emphasized Luke's reworking of the source material. John is still περισσότερον προφήτου (Luke 7:26). Furthermore, the statement μείζον ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν 'Ιωάννου οὐδείς εστιν· ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν (Luke 7:28)--upon which Conzelmann must base his view that John is for Luke "the greatest prophet"--comes directly from Q (cf. Matthew 11:11).

At Luke 8:4 Marcan material is again prominent. In this segment (8:4-9:50) the source is thoroughly Marcan. At the same time, however, Luke has made several significant alterations in the Marcan material. An obvious Lucan alteration is the transfer of the visit of the mother and brothers of Jesus from where it stands in Mark 3:31-35. In Mark the visit is before the parable of the Sower and its interpretation and the sayings on light and the right use of parable. In

---

[1] Cf. Conzelmann, p. 47.

Luke it follows the saying on the right use of parables. Taylor has suggested that this change is simply the result of the incident's being left as an isolated piece of material, for Luke has omitted the section on Beelzebub and the sin of blasphemy.[1] Taylor seems to imply that Luke has merely selected at random a place where the story of the visit of Jesus' mother and brothers might be inserted. A better suggestion is that of Conzelmann, who sees Luke as having purposely delayed the account of the visit until after the discussion of what it means to be a disciple (Luke 8:9 f.).[2] In light of the concern with the μυστηρία τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ and the explanation of the "word" of the parable, the visit of the mother and brothers of Jesus takes on new meaning. The words at the conclusion of the visit (μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μοι οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες) must be seen in light of the preceding explanation to the disciples.[3] Furthermore, Luke has placed

---

[1] Taylor, p. 85.

[2] Conzelmann, p. 48.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 47. Conzelmann has noted that in this pericope just as the brothers of Jesus stand in relation to the twelve so Mary corresponds to the Galilean women who are important witnesses for Luke.

Flender, p. 30, notes that "his [Luke's] deliberate editing of the parallelism between the disciples and the

the emphasis on hearing and doing the word of God at the end rather than at the beginning of a section on teaching as is the case in Mark.[1]

Conzelmann asserts:

> From the literary angle we may note that at Mark iii.20 Luke abandons Mark's plan. Apart from the purely literary aspect, there are two basic reasons for this alteration, the one already mentioned, viz., that Luke had his own opinion of the relatives . . . and also the fact that Luke has his own view of Jerusalem. In this connection there is a considerable degree of editorial adaptation by Luke.[2]

On this important point we must disagree with Conzelmann. Though there is "a considerable degree of editorial adaptation by Luke" (as we have also pointed out), the Marcan framework is throughout the Grundschrift of the Third Gospel. In Luke 8:22-9:50 the Third Evangelist has used Mark as his source. Yet he has not simply reproduced Mark. He has used Mark in such a way as to convey his own ideas and intentions. Though he has followed the Marcan order, by omissions and alterations he has molded the Marcan material to fit his over-all literary plan.

---

kinsfolk of Jesus (8:9-21) is obvious when compared with Mark."

[1] Charles Talbert, "The Lukan Presentation of Jesus' Ministry in Galilee," R. Exp., LXIV (1967), 488.

[2] Conzelmann, p. 75, n. 1.

In Luke 8:22-56 there is a lengthy citation of the deeds--the stilling of the storm (verses 22-25), the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (verses 26-39), the healing of the daughter of Jairus (verses 40-42a, 49-56), and the cure of the woman with a hemorrhage (verses 42b-48). Following this manifestation of power, Jesus calls together the twelve and gives them power to carry on the messianic ministry in his name (Luke 9:1-6). This important word of Jesus to his disciples is preceded not by just a single miraculous deed, but by a series of them. The word to the twelve has significance for Luke because it foreshadows the epoch of the Church when the twelve as witnesses to him will be carrying out the ministry which in "the middle of time" is basically left to Jesus alone. In this Lucan presentation the "deed-word" pattern is executed in a more grandiose manner than we have seen before. The word to the twelve is of such importance that it is balanced with a series of deeds.

The contrast with Mark in presenting the word to the twelve is noteworthy. In Mark the word to the twelve follows the rejection at Nazareth (Mark 6:1-6). Mark presents Jesus as going from Nazareth into the villages and also sending forth his disciples into the surrounding villages. This activity seems to be a response to the rejection. Because for Luke the word which introduces the ministry of the twelve must be preceded by the deeds of Jesus, he has omitted the rejection at Nazareth at this point. It did not fit his purpose at this stage in the narrative. As we have already seen,[1] Luke has used the account of the rejection at Nazareth as an introduction to the ministry as a whole in Luke 4:16-30. As the account of the rejection stands, it fits well as an introduction to the ministry of Jesus. Is it too much to suggest, however, that it is because the rejection story did not fit in Luke's plan as it stood in Mark that he first conceived of transposing it (or a parallel account) to be used as an introduction to the ministry of Jesus? Otherwise, we may suggest that the removal of the rejection at Nazareth pericope from its place in Mark has served a dual purpose for Luke.

A further contrast with Mark is seen in the Lucan presentation of the episode with Herod and John the Baptist. The change supports Luke's purpose in Luke-Acts as a whole. First, as we have seen,[2] Luke has divided the epochs of John and Jesus. In keeping with this chronological division, Luke presented the imprisonment of John before the beginning of the ministry of Jesus (Luke 3:18-20). After the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, the Baptist comes into the picture only indirectly. Thus, here in the Third Gospel, the actual account of the death of the Baptist is omitted. It is related only briefly through Herod. To shorten the episode also focuses attention away from the reality that John's ministry did, in fact, overlap with that of Jesus.

---

[1] See above, p. 165.

[2] See above, p. 149.

The shortening of this episode leads us to the second way in which Luke's treatment of Mark at this point fits into his literary purpose. It creates the impression that the twelve are away for a very short time. By curtailing the Herod episode to three verses (as compared with sixteen verses in Mark) there is time for little to happen in Luke. The twelve depart in verse six and return in verse ten. This is important for Luke, for his witnesses must have seen and heard all which Jesus did and said. As Luke presents the Herod episode, the twelve miss nothing that happens. Only the reflections of Herod are inserted here.

A further important and widely recognized problem with regard to Luke's use of Mark in this section is the omission of the material found in Mark 6:45-8:27, frequently referred to as the "great omission." Various explanations have been offered for Luke's omission of this portion of Mark.[1] It is not satisfactory to find an explanation for the omission in either the suggestion that Luke worked with an Urmarkus or a corrupted text of Mark. Such explanations are unnecessarily hypothetical. Neither is it satisfactory to resort to the suggestion that Luke intentionally omitted Mark 6:45-8:27 because of the limitation of space.[2] While the omission does seem to be intentional, we must look for an explanation. The most discerning explanation for the great omission has been suggested by Taylor in his observation that the result of this omission is that Luke 9:18-50 is throughout a Galilean section.[3] Indeed, this leaves the whole of Jesus' ministry up to this point as a Galilean ministry. Taylor did little, however, to develop the implications of his suggestion. Conzelmann has more thoroughly worked out the implications of the omission in making this a Galilean section. In discussing Taylor's observation, he has noted that "it is not so much the content as the framework of these passages that causes the omission."[1] For Luke "the idea of a journey outside Jewish territory is unthinkable."[2] In Luke the whole structure of the ministry of Jesus is tied closely to the geography of Palestine. Luke understands the ministry in terms of the Galilean ministry, the journey to Jerusalem, and, finally, a ministry in Jerusalem. This geographic structure seems to have been imposed by Luke on the ministry of Jesus despite the universal emphases which are stressed in other ways in Luke-Acts. The omission of Mark 6:45-8:27 is necessary to make the ministry a Galilean ministry until the journey begins at Luke 9:51. By the omission of Mark 6:45-8:27, Luke has deleted the trek of Jesus beyond the Sea of Galilee into the region of Tyre and Sidon.

---

[1] For a summary of the basic explanations for the "great omission" see Conzelmann, pp. 52 ff.

[2] See, for example, William Sanday, "The Conditions under Which the Gospels Were Written," S. S. P., p. 26.

[3] Taylor, p. 91.

Apart from the great omission, further evidence of Luke's endeavor to make this section of his Gospel a Galilean portion can be seen in the fact that for Luke the confession of Peter does not take place in Caesarea Philippi as it does in Mark. Instead, the place of the confession remains ambiguous. In Luke 9:10 Jesus has withdrawn with his disciples to Bethsaida, at which point Luke resumes the Marcan narrative. The feeding of the five thousand follows (Luke 9:11-17). Then, in characteristically Lucan style he reports that Jesus, still accompanied by his disciples, is praying. Once more the fact of his praying at an important moment in his ministry is reported without any mention of the content. The question of Jesus to his disciples follows: τίνα με οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν εἶναι; (Luke 9:18). Peter responds climactically τόν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 9:22).[1] No geographic notation has been given since the departure to Bethsaida in verse ten. It is not clear whether the setting for the confession is to be considered the same as the setting for the feeding of the five thousand. This ambiguity is best understood as an attempt to maintain the impression of an exclusively Galilean ministry prior to the journey to Jerusalem.

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 54.

[2] *Ibid*.

There are other less obvious, but still significant, changes which Luke has made in using Mark. We shall briefly enumerate them. First, following the confession of Peter, Luke has omitted the reference to the rebuke of Peter (cf. Mark 8:32 f.). This supports the Lucan interest in venerating the twelve.[2] Second, in Luke 9:31-32 the Third Evangelist has added the content of the conversation between Elijah, Moses, and Jesus during the transfiguration. Various aspects of the conversation are significant for the Gospel of Luke as a whole. The reference to τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν 'Ιερουσαλήμ points forward to the journey to Jerusalem and the events of Jerusalem. Certainly the reference to the sleepiness of the disciples who accompanied Jesus on the mountain is to be seen as parallel to the scene on Mt. Olivet (Luke 22:45). Further, the revelation of the glory of Jesus is typically Lucan.[1] Third, Luke has omitted the reference to the coming of Elijah (cf. Mark 9:9 ff.). Thereby, Luke again avoids making reference to John the Baptist as an Elijah figure who is a forerunner of Jesus and the kingdom.[2] Fourth, Luke has omitted the saying on offenses in Mark 9:42-48. He has recorded a similar saying from Q in Luke 17:1-2 where it fits much better into his context and better supports his purpose in the admonition of witnesses who follow Jesus.

---

[1] Talbert, in *R. Exp.*, LXIV (1967), 495, has observed that the effect of Luke's editing has been to create extensive parallels between Luke 9:1-50 and Luke 22:7-23:16. We shall refer to these parallels in our analysis of the Passion narrative. See below, pp. 221 ff.

[2] Creed, p. 130.

We have focused up to this point on the changes which Luke has made in Mark. It is now necessary to take a broader view of the intention of chapter nine and then of the entire Galilean section for the whole of Luke's work.

---

[1] Cf. Creed, p. 134.

[2] Creed, p. 135. Conzelmann, p. 25, places emphasis on the sudden coming of the Kingdom which needs no "precursor." Also see above, pp. 156 f., n. 4.

J. G. Davies has argued that Luke 9:1-36 and Acts 1:1-12 are related structurally. The accounts of the transfiguration and of the ascension have been so constructed that they have many features in common.[1] (1) There is a commissioning in each (Luke 9:1 f.; Acts 1:2, 8). In each case there is reference to δύναμις and ἐξουσία. (2) Both refer to ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 9:2, 11, 27; Acts 1:3). (3) Luke 9:5 (μαρτύριον) and Acts 1:8 (μάρτυρες) have the idea of witnesses. (4) In both John the Baptist is mentioned (Luke 9:7-9, 18-21; Acts 1:5). (5) Both refer to the return of the apostle (Luke 9:10 to Jesus; Acts 1:12 to Jerusalem). (6) In both Jesus is eating with his disciples (Luke 9:10-17; Acts 1:4). (7) In Luke 9:16 Jesus looks up into heaven (ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν); in Acts 1:11 the disciples are looking into heaven (βλέποντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν). (8) In both there is reference to Jesus' death (Luke 9:22; Acts 1:3). (9) Each has a reference to the parousia (Luke 9:26; Acts 1:11). (10) In each there are two men in white raiment (Luke 9:29-30;

---

[1] J. G. Davies, "The Prefigurement of the Ascension in the Third Gospel," *J. T. S.*, VI (1955), 229-233.

Acts 1:10). And finally, (11) there is a reference to the cloud in each (Luke 9:34; Acts 1:9). The cumulative force of these parallels in Luke 9 and Acts 1 suggests that the author has consciously used his materials to create these parallels. The ministry of Jesus in Galilee is linked with the ascension in Jerusalem. The one who ascends is he who ministered in Galilee. The witnesses in Acts 1 are the same witnesses who accompanied him in Galilee. The transfiguration is the climax of the Galilean ministry. During this phase of his ministry, the purpose of Jesus is revealed. Luke then proceeds to the next stage in the ministry of Jesus. Throughout, however, Luke continually reminds us that the ministry had its origin in Galilee. Because Galilee is the place of the origin of the witnesses, the Galilean ministry has a place of importance in Luke which is unparalleled in Mark. Charles Talbert[1] has noted that the importance of the Galilean ministry is reflected in the fact that the speeches in Acts repeat the essence of what has been reported in the Gospel account of the Galilean ministry. This is especially reflected in the speeches of Peter in Acts 1:15-22 and 10:34-43.

---

[1] Talbert, in R. Exp., LXIV (1967), 490.

Thus the whole of the Galilean ministry from 4:31 to 9:50 becomes the foundation of the over-all ministry of Jesus and the foundation of the Church. It prepares the way for the pilgrimage of Jesus to Jerusalem and, subsequently, for the Church's pilgrimage beginning from Jerusalem.

Luke 9:51-19:27

Luke has expanded the concept of a journey to Jerusalem as it is presented in Mark so that the journey to Jerusalem is a major portion of the Third Gospel. The journey concept provides the framework for the central section of the Third Gospel.

The manner in which Luke has used the journey motif has made it difficult to ascertain the precise extent of the journey. Though the beginning of the journey at Luke 9:51 is quite obvious,[1] it is more difficult to discern its end. The work of Streeter and Taylor is representative of the traditional view in that they see Luke 18:14 as the end of the journey with Luke 18:15 ff. returning to the Marcan source.[2]

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 63.

[2] Streeter, p. 203; Taylor, pp. 151 ff.; Ernst Lohmeyer, Galiläa und Jerusalem (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht,

Proponents of this traditional view are, however, more concerned with what sources Luke is using and where he returns to the use of Mark as a source than with the idea of a journey as such. Schmidt, however, has observed that the concept of a journey does not coincide with Luke's use of Marcan or non-Marcan sources.[1] A mark of Schmidt's perceptivity is that he has looked more at the Gospel of Luke as a whole than at the sources which Luke has employed.[2] Jesus does not complete his journey until he arrives at Jerusalem. In Luke 19:11 Jesus is still on the way to Jerusalem: διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἰερουσαλήμ. Though Luke 19:28 is ambiguous as to whether or not Jesus has entered Jerusalem, at this point Jesus does seem to have reached Jerusalem. The ambiguity is intentional on the part of Luke who does not wish to have Jesus enter the city proper. Rather, he has Jesus go directly to the temple without acknowledging his

---

1936), pp. 41 ff. R.H. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), p. 137, sees Luke 9:51 as the beginning of a period which ends with the ascension in Acts 1.

[1] Schmidt, *Die Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 146 ff.

[2] Of Schmidt, Conzelmann, p. 63, says: "Schmidt's argument is worthy of consideration, because he does not argue from observations concerning sources, but from the present structure."

entry into the city.[1] Inasmuch as Luke envisions a ministry in Jerusalem which is based on Jesus' activity in the temple, the journey to Jerusalem must end at Luke 19:27. The clause καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν, ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτήν is problematic. It is, however, best explained as a result of the ambiguity of the Lucan picture. The material of the entry account (Luke 19:28 ff.) certainly implies that the goal of the city has been reached.

Having determined that the journey ends at Luke 19:27, let us look at another aspect of the length of the journey, namely, its temporal length. From the text it is impossible to determine the temporal limits of the journey to Jerusalem. For Luke the exact time-span of the journey is not in itself significant. Luke is, however, concerned with creating the impression of a span of time comparable to the period of the Galilean ministry. The journey becomes the second stage in the ministry of Jesus.[2] To emphasize that these two stages of Jesus' ministry are comparable, Luke has drawn analogies between the two periods. We shall look more closely at these analogies in examining the narrative itself. Our intention here is simply to note that the journey does represent a definite stage in the ministry of Jesus.[1] The contrast with Mark is noteworthy. For Mark, the fact of the journey alone is important.[2] By filling out the brief statements of Mark which refer to the journey, Luke has created the impression of a period of time comparable in length to the Galilean ministry.

---

[1] See above, p. 100.

[2] Cf. Conzelmann, p. 62: "It is not possible to reconstruct the length of this period from the sources. The present text suggests a considerable period of time, equal in importance to the preceding one."

The question of the locale of the Lucan journey is also a matter of significance in our analysis of the Third Gospel. Streeter recognizes that to call the Lucan travel narrative "The Perean section," as is sometimes done, is a misnomer.[3] C. C. McCown has asserted: "The only excuse for speaking of a 'Perean section' or of a 'Perean ministry' of

---

[1] Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 63, observes: ". . . He has introduced a completely new period into the life of Jesus with the report of journeying that begins at 9^{51}."

[2] Robinson, pp. 43 ff., has emphasized the importance of the fact of the journey in Luke. See also an article by Robinson, "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative (9:51ff.)," J. B. L., LXXIX (1960), 20-31. Robinson is, however, arguing more against attempts to designate the locale of the journey than against attempts to determine its temporal limits.

[3] Streeter, p. 203. C. C. McCown, "The Geography of Luke's Central Section," J. B. L., LVI (1938), 51, cites Schleiermacher as the one to give currency to the title "Perean section" for the central section of Luke.

Jesus in Luke grew out of the vicious practice of attempting to 'harmonize'."[1] We may, therefore, dismiss this alternative explanation of the locale of Luke's journey. More problematic is the question of whether or not there is in Luke an account of a journey through Samaria. Lohmeyer sees the central section of Luke as a mission in Samaria.[2] McCown was more emphatic in his statement:

> In view of the deliberate omission [πέραν τοῦ 'Ιορδάνου], the only legitimate conclusion is that he intended his Gospel to mean just what any reader who did not know Mark or Matthew would understand it to mean: that the central section records a supposed mission in Samaria. . . . This section, as a Samaritan ministry is an essential member of the Gospel's threefold plan (1) Galilee (3:1-9:50), (2) Samaria (9:51-19:27) and (3) Jerusalem (19:28-24:53).[3]

Bultmann has asserted that Luke has been unsuccessful in his attempt to create and maintain the fiction of the Samaritan journey.[4] The question remains: Did Luke intend a Samaritan journey at all? Conzelmann says that he did not.[5] Only three passages in the travel narrative refer either to Samaria

---

1. McCown, in *J. B. L.*, LVI (1938), 61.

2. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, p. 43.

3. McCown, in *J. B. L.*, LVI (1938), 63.

4. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 363.

5. Conzelmann, pp. 68 ff.

or to Samaritans. In two of these, Samaritans are involved in the account (Luke 10:29-37 and 17:11-19). The presence of Samaritans does not, however, necessarily imply that that which occurs takes place in Samaria. We are then left with Luke 9:51-56 and 17:11 as the only passages from which a journey through Samaria can be deduced. The difficulty of the clause διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας is widely recognized. Conzelmann argues that whether this clause is translated "through the midst of" or "between" it is strange that Samaria comes before Galilee.[1] Conzelmann notes:

> It is also not a man from Jerusalem who would express himself in this way, but a man who is not familiar with the country. What is more, the style shows that the statement derives from Luke himself. He has set it out in a very simple way, by combining two facts:
>
> a) Jesus is on the journey from Galilee to Judea.
>
> b) He meets a group of nine Jews and one Samaritan, and is thus on the border between Galilee and Samaria.
>
> Most explanations take account of this, but the further question must be considered, whether Luke really had a quite definite but incorrect conception. The expression indicates that Luke imagines that Judea and Galilee are immediately adjacent, and that Samaria lies alongside them, apparently bordering on both regions. This idea is not inconceivable for a man who knows that the inhabitants of Galilee

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 68. Cf. Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon, p. 508.

and Judea are Jewish and that the Samaritans are distinct from them.[1]

On the basis of this argument Conzelmann says that the phrase διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας in Luke 17:11 does not imply a journey into Samaria, but rather that Jesus traveled along the border of Samaria as Samaria joined Galilee.[2] Thus the journey was from Galilee along the border of Samaria to Jerusalem. This leaves only Luke 9:51-56 as the basis of argument for a journey through Samaria. With reference to this passage Conzelmann argues: "And as here it is a question of rejection, even this argument falls to the ground."[1] Jesus approaches Samaria, but he is rejected (Luke 9:53), and thus he does not enter Samaria. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that even in 9:51-56 Luke does not say that Jesus entered Samaria. It is the disciples who enter the Samaritan villages (Luke 9:52). It does appear, then, that for Luke there is no journey through Samaria. That this was probably not in fact the case is beside the point. This is the way Luke has portrayed the journey.[2]

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 69. Conzelmann cites Acts 9:31 as further evidence. He also cites Pliny and Strabo as having understood Palestinian geography in the same way as Luke. The citation from Pliny is obscure. We read, however, in Book V, chapter 15, of Pliny's *Natural History* as follows: "Beyond Idumaea and Samaria, Judaea extends far and wide. That part of it which joins up to Syria is called Galilaea, while that which is nearest Arabia and Egypt bears the name of Peraea."--*The Natural History of Pliny*, translated by John Bostock and J. T. Riley (Bohn's Classical Library; London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855), I, 427.

The evidence from Strabo is from *Στράβωνος Γεωγραφικῶν*, Book XVI.760: Τοιοῦτοι γὰρ οἱ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἔχοντες καὶ τον [sic]'Ιερεικοῦντα καὶ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν καὶ Σαμάρειαν ἣν 'Ηρώδης Σεβαντὴν ἐπωνόμκαεν. This sentence hardly affirms a view of Palestinian geography comparable to Luke's. Yet, the very next sentence from Strabo does indicate that the people of all the areas mentioned in the above quotation from Strabo are called Judeans. Strabo says: οὕτω δ' ὄντων μιγάδων , ἡ κρατοῦσα μάλιστα φήμη τῶν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν τοῖς 'Ιεροσολύμοις πιστευομένων 'Αιγυπτίους ἀποφαίνει τοὺς προγόνους τῶν νῦν 'Ιουδαίων λεγομένων.--*The Geography of Strabo*, with an English translation by Horace L. Jones (Loeb Classical Library; London: William Heinemann, 1930), VII, 280.

[2] Creed, p. 217, who conceives of Luke as narrating a journey through Samaria, also takes this phrase to mean that Jesus was at this point in the narrative traveling along the border between Samaria and Galilee.

---

1. Conzelmann, p. 71.

2. One of the most vocal critics of Conzelmann's view of Lucan geography is Robinson. His criticism is not so much of the locale which Conzelmann defines for the journey as the fact that Conzelmann has Luke thinking in terms of a geographic realm. Robinson is concerned to demonstrate in Luke the continuing "way of the Lord" with little concern for geography. Robinson, pp. 51 ff., says: "In a sense then the journey has no locale of its own but is constructed with reference to its function as a transition between two important places of the pattern, Galilee and Jerusalem . . . . Interpretation of the travel account goes astray when it is based on the assumption that Luke was interested in the specific locale of static geography; e.g., that he thought of the trip as located in non-Jewish territory (Samaria) and thus as foreshadowing the mission to non-Jews, or that he thought of the trip as not in Samaria because Jesus was rejected there (Lk. 9:53), and made a practice of not returning to places where he had been rejected."

Those who have emphasized the mission of Jesus in Samaria have stressed that this is parallel to the Gentile mission in Acts.[1] Even without Jesus' journey through Samaria, however, the mission to the Gentiles is still prefigured. Jesus does minister to the Samaritans--though not in Samaria (Luke 17:11 ff.). Concern for the Samaritan is expressed in Luke 10:29 ff. Furthermore, the sending of messengers into the Samaritan villages in Luke 9:52 provides a parallel with the Gentile mission in Acts. Indeed the parallelism is more complete as Luke has presented it, for it is the disciples who go to those outside the house of Israel in both the Third Gospel and in Acts.

Not only does the journey represent for Luke a definite stage in the ministry of Jesus, but the journey also provides a parallel to that stage in the development of the Church in Acts where the followers of Jesus reverse the journey. Whereas Jesus' journey was to Jerusalem, the journey of the Church is away from Jerusalem and eventually to Rome. Inasmuch as the journey of Jesus is paradigmatic for the journey of the Church, it is not by accident that Luke has chosen to draw together in the context of the journey many sayings of Jesus.[1] The teachings of Jesus are the basis for the action of the Church in its journey.

---

[1] See, for example, Creed, p. 140.

The accumulation of sayings and teachings in the context of the journey also supports Luke's preference for a deed-word pattern. As Luke has chosen to present the ministry of Jesus, the first stage (the Galilean ministry) is *primarily* a stage in which Jesus' identity is established by what he *does*. The second stage of his ministry (the journey) focuses primarily on what Jesus *says*.[2] This is congruous with the description found in Acts 1:2--. . . πάντων ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν.

Let us turn now to a more direct analysis of the account of the journey to see how Luke has given his own special emphases to the material which he has used. It will not be possible in this section to point to the distinctive features of the Lucan portrayal of the Gospel by indicating the way in which he has used Mark. As we have already seen, Luke 9:51-18:14 is composed of non-Marcan material. We have also seen that Luke has drawn together non-Marcan material within the framework of the journey motif which he has borrowed from Mark and that the connecting links within the journey section of the Third Gospel are primarily the editorial work of Luke. We may therefore assume that we can see the result of Luke's editorial work--either in his exercise of choice in selection of the material or in the redaction of the material--where the materials have been drawn together in such a way as to focus on features of the ministry of Jesus which are characteristic of Luke.

---

[1] Bo Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *Studia Evangelica*, edited by Kurt Aland *et al.* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, LXXIII; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), pp. 206-216.

[2] The "primarily" needs to be stressed in each case. There is no intention to deny the presence of either word in the Galilean period or deed in the journey section. Yet the distinct impression is that of a period characterized by deed, followed by a period in which the words of Jesus are predominant.

The introductory paragraph of the journey account (Luke 9:51-56) serves as an introduction to the whole section in much the same way that Luke 4:16-30 serves as an introduction to the Galilean ministry.[1] Just as Luke 4:16-30 gives intimation of what is to come, so does Luke 9:51-56. The goal of the journey is clearly expressed: καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (verse 51).

---

[1] We must not, however, overlook the significance which Luke 4:16-30 has as an introduction to the whole of Jesus' ministry.

In a more subtle manner, the more ultimate goal of Jesus seems to be suggested in the phrase ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ, a phrase which looks ahead not only to his arrival in Jerusalem, but which is also a prolepsis of his ἀναλήμψις in Acts 1:9.

Conzelmann has emphasized that both Luke 4:16-30 and Luke 9:51-56 portray Jesus as being rejected and not returning to the place of his rejection.[1] The rejection in Luke 9:53 (καὶ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν, ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ) is not so dramatic as the rejection at Nazareth. The rejection is, however, a fact in the Lucan presentation. The withdrawal from the area of rejection is more problematic. It depends on Conzelmann's understanding of Lucan geography, the same understanding which we have accepted above.[2] If it is Luke's intention to portray Jesus as withdrawing from the place of his rejection, then the parallel between the introductions of the first two stages of Jesus' ministry is all the more impressive.

The advice to those who follow Jesus in Luke 9:57 ff. has an impact other than that which it has in Matthew. For

---

[1] Conzelmann, pp. 65 f.

[2] See above, pp. 193 ff.

Luke, the homelessness of the Son of Man has a new significance following the rejection. The saying of Jesus in verse 62 (οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπ' ἄρατρον δαὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω εὔθετός ἐστιν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ) has an important thrust, placed as it is at the beginning of the journey. The words are an important directive for the journey to Jerusalem as a whole and also for the journey from Jerusalem in Acts.

The account of the appointing and sending of seventy disciples again provides several parallels with the Galilean period of Jesus' ministry.[1] The appointing of the seventy is in itself comparable in nature to the choosing of twelve apostles in Luke 6:12-16. The mission of the seventy may be compared to the mission of the twelve in Luke 9:1 ff. The appointing of the seventy is also comparable to the selection of seven men of good repute in Acts 6:1 ff. Both make possible a broader mission. The reference in Luke 10:1 to ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα indicates that the seventy did not include the twelve. Thus, as was true in the Lucan presentation of the mission of the twelve, the twelve remain as witnesses to all which Jesus did and said. Luke's portrayal of the mission of the seventy does not necessarily assume that even the seventy have missed anything which Jesus did or said, for as Jesus completed his words of instruction in verse 16, Luke reports in verse 17: ὑπέστρεψεν δὲ οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα. Thus the seventy can also be witnesses. Presumably at least part of the seventy are among those who accompany Jesus to Jerusalem and thus become authentic witnesses of the whole of his ministry. We must assume that the women who accompany Jesus to the end are at least a part of the group from which the seventy were chosen.

---

[1] Cf. Flender, p. 22.

In the mission of the seventy the pattern of ministry outlined is much the same as that of Jesus himself. Deed is to precede word: καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῆ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς· ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία (verse 9). Wherever they are met with rejection, from there they are to depart (verse 10 ff.).[1]

The connection between the blessing of the disciples after the return of the seventy and the conversation of Jesus with the lawyer (Luke 10:25 ff.) is not a smooth transition. The discourse between Jesus and the lawyer does, however, serve as an introduction to the parable of the Good Samaritan, the use of which supports Luke's interest in universalism.[1]

---

[1] Flender, p. 22, sees the rejection of the cities described in Luke 10:13-15 as parallel to the rejection by Herod in Luke 9:7-9. Although both rejections are presented in conjunction with a mission, they are to be distinguished. The rejection by Herod is more closely connected with Jesus himself, while the rejection of Luke 10:13-15 is connected with the mission of the seventy.

The account of Jesus' visit with Mary and Martha is set into the framework of the journey. The emphasis of the pericope is in keeping with the emphasis on decision and commitment at the very beginning of the journey (Luke 9:57-62).

The portrayal of Jesus praying in Luke 11:1 is typically Lucan.[2] Yet this prayer scene is different. Usually Luke portrays Jesus as praying before an important event. Here Jesus' praying is more an example for the disciples than in previous instances. The content of the prayer of Jesus is significant for the disciples ask him to teach them to pray and he responds with a model prayer. The prayer becomes essentially a part of the teaching of Jesus which dominates the journey period of his ministry. Once the theme of prayer is introduced, the parable of the friend at midnight (verses 5-8) further illustrates the principle of prayer. Verses 9-13 illustrate the concern of God for those who ask of Him. The affirmation that Jesus was praying provides the setting for the material which is connected with the theme of prayer.

Taylor has suggested that the fact that material is grouped around a topic such as prayer is indicative of the connected source prior to the Third Gospel as we have it.[3] This source, he says, is Proto-Luke. If, however, as both

---

[1] Cf. Creed, p. 151.

[2] See above, pp. 172 f.

[3] Taylor, pp. 151 ff.

Streeter and Taylor have suggested, Proto-Luke and the Third Gospel as we know it are the work of the same author, it becomes extremely difficult--if not impossible--to distinguish Proto-Luke from the work of Luke in the final edition of the Gospel. The same concerns would have motivated the Third Evangelist in his grouping of materials regardless of the stage at which it was done. The distinction of Proto-Luke also becomes unnecessary to explain the grouping of the material.

The Beelzebub controversy in Luke 11:14 ff. is an episode which provides a theme to which the saying on the return of the evil spirit is attached. The pericope dealing with the saying to the generation which seeks a sign (Luke 11:29-36) is also connected with the Beelzebub controversy inasmuch as it picks up the reference to those who seek a sign in Luke 11:16.[1] Again there is no evidence that the collection of material around a given theme is the work of anyone other than the Third Evangelist.

In Luke 11:37 there is reference to the Pharisees and Jesus' rebuke of them. In the woes which follow in the remainder of chapter eleven, the Pharisees, scribes and lawyers are closely associated with one another. The Pharisees, scribes and lawyers as a group are set over against Jesus. The summary statement in Luke 11:53-54 (κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτόν περὶ πλειόνων, ἐνδρεύοντες αὐτόν θηρεῦσαί τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ .) engenders an awareness of a developing tension between Jesus and the Jews which is a working out of the theme of the rejection of Jesus which is prevalent in the Third Gospel.

---

[1] See above, p. 83.

The theme of conflict with the Pharisees continues in chapter twelve. The discourse to the disciples begins with a note of contrast between the Pharisees and the disciples (Luke 12:1). The disciples are extolled to live a style of life which is in contrast to the Pharisees. They are exhorted to carefree, yet watchful and faithful, living in the ensuing preparation for the coming Son of Man. It is around this theme that the whole of chapter twelve is constructed, concluding with the theme of judgment. The theme of judgment is then the point of focus in the beginning of chapter thirteen with the account of Pilate's mingling the blood of the Galileans with their sacrifice and the parable of the fig tree which seems to say that the Jewish people will be given more time before their judgment.

The familiar Lucan emphasis of Jesus' teaching in a synagogue[1] is seen again in Luke 13:10. This provides the setting for the healing of the woman with a spirit of infirmity, which in turn functions to bring again into focus the rejection of Jesus by the rulers of the synagogue who are representatives of all the Jewish people (Luke 13:14 ff.).

---

[1] Cf. Luke 4:16 which seems to set a pattern for Jesus' entire ministry, a pattern which is followed in the ministry of the Church as presented in Acts.

The tension increases in Luke 13:22 ff., where the saying of Jesus is a judgment upon Israel. Their rejection of Jesus is in a sense to be rewarded by God's dealing with them. The unwillingness of the Pharisees as representatives of Israel to accept responsibility for the reality of the events is reflected in their attempt to blame Herod for Jesus' rejection: ἔξελθε καὶ πορεύου ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι Ἡρώδης θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι (Luke 13:31). This foreshadows the events of the Passion (Luke 23:6-16), and Jesus turns attention to Jerusalem and the Passion in Luke 13:32-35.

In chapter fourteen Luke continues to project the theme of tension between Jesus and the Pharisees. Though Jesus is a guest on the Sabbath in the home of a Pharisee in Luke 14:1, the true situation is reflected in the clause καὶ αὐτοὶ παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν. In this setting a man with dropsy is healed by Jesus, an act which brings out the tension between Jesus and the Pharisees. Luke has brought together in this setting a group of sayings, all of which have in common the theme of a feast (Luke 14:1-24).[1] The parable of the great supper emphasizes the invitation which has been extended to Israel and which Israel has rejected, again carrying out the theme of rejection. The invitation is then extended to those to whom the servant is sent: ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς (Luke 14:23). Following the invitation to those outside Israel, stress is once more given to the conditions of discipleship (Luke 14:25-35) which are so important for Luke in the journey section.

---

[1] See above, p. 87 f.

Chapter fifteen continues the theme of God's concern as it is reflected in the parable of the great supper. God is concerned for all. The fact is reflected in the parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin as well as in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The contrast of the attitudes of the older son with that of the younger son and the father throws into relief the attitudes of the Pharisees and thereby continues the emphasis on the Pharisees which is dominant throughout this section of the Third Gospel. Again there is little reason not to attribute the editorial work of bringing together the material of chapter fifteen to Luke himself. The themes reflected in the present structure of chapter fifteen are but a continuation of the themes which are dominant in the Third Gospel as a whole as it now stands. Thus, there is a lack of evidence for attributing the work of uniting the material of chapter fifteen to an earlier stage of Luke's literary efforts as is required by the Proto-Luke hypothesis.[1]

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 151 ff.

The warning against commitment to the wrong ends dominates chapter sixteen. This warning is reflected in the parables of the unjust servant (Luke 16:1-9) and of the rich man and Lazarus (verses 19-31). The intervening discourse (Luke 16:10-15) follows the same theme. In verse fifteen there is reference to οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων . These seem to introduce the law, the upholding of which is the means by which the Pharisees were seeking to justify themselves. The law, which is referred to along with the prophets, is discussed in terms which reflect Luke's understanding of the history of salvation: ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται . . . (Luke 16:16). A comparison of this verse and the Matthean parallel indicates how Luke has schematized the tradition (cf. Matthew 11:12-13). Conzelmann sees this verse as a crux interpretum for the Lucan understanding of the history of salvation.[1] Indeed, he has been criticized for placing too much emphasis on this one verse.[2] The fact remains, however, that the division of epochs that is reflected in this verse can be seen elsewhere as well.[3]

Having indicated the condemnation which results from failure to heed the proclamation of the Kingdom of God (as seems to be the implication of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, as it is placed), Luke then turns attention primarily to the disciples and the way which is before them. There is the assurance of temptations (verse 1), followed by the plea for forgiveness of one's brother (verses 2-4). Then comes a plea for faith (verses 5-6) and fulfillment of one's duty (verses 7-10). The story of the healing of the ten lepers, nine Jews and one Samaritan, indicates Jesus' compassion for those other than the Jewish people. It also indicates the acceptance of Jesus by the non-Jew, while he is rejected by the Jewish people, a theme which is prevalent throughout Acts. (See, for example, Acts 2:23; 3:13; 4:10; 5:30; 10:39 and 28:26 ff.) It is the faith of the non-Jew which is commended. His faith makes him a follower. Indeed, the faith of the Samaritan is the reality of the Kingdom to which Jesus refers in verse 21, a present reality which the Pharisees are unwilling to accept even when they see it. Instead, they seek a different type sign which they are denied. This sets the stage for the discourse on the days of the Son of Man (Luke 17:22-37), a discourse which indicates that it is not appropriate to look for a sign.

---

[1] Conzelmann, pp. 25, 112, 185.

[2] Robinson, pp. 13 f. See also Minear, Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 121 f.

[3] See above, pp. 149 ff., 156 ff., 159, 161.

The two parables at the beginning of chapter eighteen bring together themes from the preceding chapter. The parable of the unjust judge (Luke 18:1-8) is told as a parable of encouragement and as such seems to be directed at the disciples. The parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector (Luke 18:9-14) is addressed πρός τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶν δίκαιοι καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντας . This is a parable of contrast, the positive thrust of which militates against the Pharisees in much the same manner as we have seen earlier in the Third Gospel.

Here we come to the end of the non-Marcan material with which Streeter and Taylor see the journey narrative ending. We have seen, however, that the journey continues until Jesus arrives in Jerusalem.[1] There is not at Luke 18:14 a division in stages of either the ministry of Jesus or the narrative itself. Rather the narrative proceeds in such a manner that a change would hardly be detectable were it not for our knowledge of Mark. The scene with Jesus and the children (Luke 18:15-17) continues the same thought that is expressed in verse 14b: πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται .

The story of the rich ruler's attempt to find out what it is necessary to do in order to inherit eternal life follows the same theme which dominated the whole of chapter sixteen. His wealth is a barrier. This story is followed by an expression of concern by Peter that they who had forsaken their possessions might not be rewarded. The response of Jesus, though using Marcan material, supports a major theme of the journey narrative as a whole, namely, that the demands on those who follow the way of the Lord are great. For their faithfulness, those who do follow will be rewarded ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκαν ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τουτῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον (verses 29-30).

---

[1] See above, pp. 190 ff.

The prediction of the Passion (Luke 18:31ff.) follows Mark closely except for the addition of verse 34: καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνῆκαν, καὶ ἦν κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα. Luke also adds in verse 3 the clause τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. This addition heightens the Lucan emphasis on fulfillment of prophecy.[1]

The story of the healing of the blind man (Luke 18: 35-43) is reproduced much as it occurs in Mark. We have already noted the change which Luke has made in order to have this story and the story of Zacchaeus take place at Jericho.[2] Luke has also made a significant change at the end of the story. Whereas Mark has simply: καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Mark 10:52b); Luke has: καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν. καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἰδὼν ἔδωκεν αἶνον τῷ θεῷ

---

[1] Schubert, pp. 173 ff.

[2] See above,

(verse 43). The emphasis on glorifying and praising God is characteristic of Luke.[1]

The story of Zacchaeus has been added by Luke (Luke 19:1-10). The thrust of the story seems to be associated with the fact that Zacchaeus is a Jew and yet does not reject Jesus.[2] Zacchaeus is, however, not the type Jew who has rejected Jesus throughout the Third Gospel. He is not among the religious leaders as are the Pharisees. He is a tax collector. He is repentant; and, therefore, he is accepted by Jesus. It is clear that Jesus has come to Israel. Though Israel has, as a whole, rejected Jesus, this rejection is not inevitable. By the affirmation of Jesus in verse 9 (σήμερον σωτηρία τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦτῳ ἐγένετο, καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς ᾿Αβραάμ ἐστιν), Luke makes it clear that in Jesus salvation is given. Σήμερον seems to refer here, as in Luke 4:21[3] to the time of the ministry of Jesus, a time upon which the Church looks back. Zacchaeus becomes a type of the believer within the house of Israel.

The parable of pounds in Luke 19:11-27 appears to be in some way connected with the Matthean parable of the talents.

---

[1] See above, p. 47. See also Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 17, 37.

[2] Cf. Creed, p. 229.

[3] Conzelmann, p. 36. See above, p. 166. Minear, *Studies in Luke-Acts*, p. 123, feels that Conzelmann has put too much emphasis on σήμερον.

The difference between the content of the parables is, however, not our interest. The reason which Luke gives for Jesus' having told the parable is more important. Luke states: ἀκουόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα προσθεὶς εἶπεν παραβολήν, διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἰερουσαλὴμ αὐτὸν καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὅτι παραχρῆμα μέλλει ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναφαίνεσθαι (verse 11). In terms of the literary structure of the Gospel of Luke there is reason not to think that the Kingdom is approaching with the arrival at Jerusalem. As Luke has structured the Third Gospel, he has attempted to create the impression of an extended stage of Jesus' ministry after his arrival in Jerusalem.[1] Probably more significant here, however, is Luke's eschatological perspective which links the Kingdom with the παρουσία for which the Church still waits in Luke's day. The Kingdom for Luke does not arrive even with the culmination of events in Jerusalem.[2] Of the parable Creed says:

> In the parable Jesus teaches that he must first go away in order to receive the kingdom, and an interval must elapse before he returns. That interval is, for his disciples, a time of testing and, according to the quality of their service during that interval, will be their status in the kingdom when the Lord comes back.[3]

With this emphasis on the continuing way which the Church experiences, the journey portion of the Gospel ends, appropriately emphasizing the continuing life of the disciples who have been prepared for the life in the Church by their journeying with Jesus in Galilee, but more importantly from Galilee to Jerusalem.

---

[1] See below, p. 215.

[2] Conzelmann, pp. 113 ff.

[3] Creed, p. 232.

Luke 19:28-24:53

Unlike Mark, Luke does not arrange the activity of Jesus in Jerusalem so as to create the impression of a Passion week. While using Marcan material, Luke does not telescope the events of Jerusalem into a day by day account. Instead, Luke breaks up the daily routine of Mark so as to create the impression of an extended ministry centered in Jerusalem which is comparable in length to the ministry in Galilee and the ministry of the journey.[1] Thus we have a third stage in the ministry of Jesus. It can be easily observed that this stage of the ministry begins with the entry (Luke 19:28 ff.), whereupon Jesus goes directly to the temple. The end of this stage of Jesus' ministry, however, is more difficult to discern. Conzelmann has suggested that the end is the return of Satan in Luke 22:3.[2] With the return of Satan the period of salvation is over. According to Conzelmann, the period of salvation has its beginning with the departure of Satan during the temptation of Jesus (Luke 4:13--καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ). The period of the ministry of Jesus is, therefore, a period without temptation.[1] With the return of Satan the period of salvation and thus the ministry of Jesus ends.[2] With Luke 22:10, the first mention that Jesus is in the city proper, the period of the Passion begins.[3] It is not clear, however, just what Conzelmann means by the "time of the Passion." In the categories which Conzelmann has outlined in his analysis of Luke, there is the epoch of Jesus' ministry which is followed immediately by the epoch of the Church. It is clear that the Passion is not a part of the epoch of the Church. Yet how is it related to the epoch of the ministry of Jesus? The lack of clarity with which Conzelmann distinguishes what he calls the "time of the Passion" calls into question the correctness of his analysis of the Third Gospel at the point at which he suggests that the period of salvation is complete with the return of Satan at Luke 22:3. Such an early end leaves an unclassified period between the last two epochs of salvation history.

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 77. See also Creed, p. 237.

[2] Conzelmann, p. 80.

---

[1] It is interesting to observe in confirmation of this that Luke has omitted the clause ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ· (Mark 8:33) is omitted in Luke's account of Peter's confession (Luke 9:18 ff.). See Conzelmann, p. 56.

[2] *Ibid*.

[3] *Ibid*.

Where, then, does the third sub-epoch of Jesus' ministry begin? Robinson has asked the same question of Conzelmann. Robinson says:

> Where is one to mark the division between the epoch of Jesus and that of the Church? At 22:3? At 22:8, where the new time of "temptation" begins? At 22:35ff, which "mark the break, the transition to a new epoch, in which different conditions prevail than hitherto, for peace under the protection of Jesus is now a thing of the past?" At the passion? At the resurrection/ascension? Ascension alone? Pentecost?[1]

If our earlier analysis is correct,[2] the epoch of the ministry of Jesus is characterized primarily by the fact that during his ministry the Spirit is entrusted to him alone. It is this factor which is the prime mark of distinction for the epoch of Jesus' ministry. The point at which the Spirit is poured out to the Church in general is Pentecost (Acts 2:4). In Acts 1:5 and 8 the apostles are promised the Spirit. Not until Pentecost, however, does the Spirit again become rampant as it was in the epoch of Israel.[3] Up until the time of Pentecost, the Spirit is possessed only by Jesus. The "middle of time" seems to end with the ascension which is reported in Acts 1:9. This event is, however, anticipated in Luke 24:51

---

[1] Robinson, p. 69. At some point in his writings Conzelmann has intimated that each point cited by Robinson has something to do with the end of "the middle of time." Yet Conzelmann has most directly cited Luke 22:3, the return of Satan, as the end of the ministry of Jesus.

[2] See above, pp. 152 ff.

[3] This is not to say that there is no distinction between the Spirit of the epoch of Israel and the Spirit in Acts.

(διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν).[1] Thus Luke seems to desire to have the end of the "middle of time" coincide with the end of the Gospel. There are, nonetheless, problems involved. The summary statement of resumé and anticipation in the opening verses of Acts makes it difficult to delineate precisely the division of epochs.

Taking the ascension as the end of the epoch of Jesus' ministry, we have, then, a third sub-epoch which extends from the entry which brings Jesus into the temple (beginning at Luke 19:28) to the very end of the earthly ministry of Jesus. Having defined the end of the third sub-epoch of the ministry of Jesus, let us look more closely at Luke's presentation of it.[2]

The ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem is for Luke primarily a teaching ministry. This is made clear not only in the statement of Luke 19:47 (καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ), but also in Luke 20:1, 21:37 and 22:53. Furthermore, the omission of the Marcan account of the cursing of the fig tree (Mark 11:12-14, 20-26) removes from the Jerusalem ministry the only miracle which is reported by Mark. Thus the Jerusalem ministry is for Luke without miracles.[1]

---

[1] The intent of the statement of Luke 24:51 is ambiguous. The addition καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν seems to be an attempt to make the phrase διέστη ἀπ' αὐτων more explicit. It is to make too little of the statement to suggest that it means no more than the statement ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτων in verse 31. See Schubert, p. 168.

[2] Robinson, pp. 24 ff., argues that it is not possible to substantiate a third sub-epoch as Conzelmann has done. Thus, Robinson does not agree with the whole attempt by Conzelmann to distinguish three sub-epochs in the ministry of Jesus. Robinson's primary argument against Conzelmann is that the third sub-epoch has no epiphany scene comparable to the baptism or transfiguration. While Robinson objects to Conzelmann's argument on the basis that the Mt. of Olives scene is not really an epiphany, he also notes that the Mt. of Olives scene is outside the epoch of Jesus as defined by Conzelmann which ends at Luke 22:3.

Robinson is inclined to see only two sub-epochs, one of the Galilean ministry and one extending from the ἀναλημψις of Luke 9:51 to the ἀναλήμψις of Acts 1:2, 9, 22.

We have already noted that in Luke Jesus goes directly to the temple without explicit reference to his entering the city.[2] Thus his entry becomes a conquest of the temple. With the conquest of the temple, Jesus and his followers become the right worshippers.[3] Jesus takes over the temple which becomes the center for his ministry in Jerusalem. Each of the summary statements of his teaching in Jerusalem relates it to the temple.[4] Even the apocalyptic discourse of Luke 21:5-36 is spoken openly in the temple, in contrast with Mark 13:1 ff. in which Jesus leaves the temple and delivers the discourse privately to his disciples.[5]

Luke's view of the relation of the fall of Jerusalem to the eschaton is different from the view of Mark. Mark seems to associate the destruction of Jerusalem with the end. This affects the perspective of the whole of the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13. Luke, on the other hand, disassociates the fall of Jerusalem and the eschaton.[1] For Luke the fall of Jerusalem seems to be a past fact.[2] This difference in perspective lies at the root of the differences between the apocalyptic discourse in Mark and that in Luke.[3] Though there are details which may have come from a source other than Mark, there is little need to assert a non-Marcan source for the Lucan discourse as a whole. The difference lies primarily in a different chronological perspective and, consequently, a different theological perspective with reference to the Parousia.

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 78. The healing of the ear of the slave of the high priest in Luke 22:51 is, of course, a miracle. That event is, however, outside the public ministry of Jesus.

[2] See above, p. 101.

[3] Cf. Conzelmann, p. 78.

[4] See Luke 19:47; 20:1; 21:37 and 22:53.

[5] Conzelmann, p. 79, and Robinson, p. 72.

What, then, is the significance of the lament over Jerusalem and her fall in the Third Gospel? Robinson has suggested that in separating the destruction of Jerusalem from the end of history Luke has placed the event within the realm of history as fulfillment of prophecy.[4] This idea is expressed in Luke 21:22: ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως αὗταί εἰσιν τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα . In the lament of Jesus over Jerusalem in Luke 19:41-44 there is also prediction of the fate of Jerusalem. In the fulfillment of prophecy the Gentiles are the instruments of God's wrath.[1] Furthermore, the emphasis on the destruction of Jerusalem as a fulfillment of prophecy accords with Luke's political apologetic whereby little guilt is ascribed to Rome.[2] Jerusalem brings destruction upon herself by her rejection of Jesus. In Luke 20:1-8 the authority of Jesus is questioned. In the parable of the vineyard (Luke 20:9-16), the rejection of Jesus is figuratively stated. The rejection of Jesus is related to scripture and is seen by Luke in terms of fulfillment of prophecy in Luke 20:17-18. The rejection becomes concrete in the plot against Jesus which begins to unfold in Luke 20:19-40, a plot which is the climax of the tensions which gradually developed through the chapters of the journey.[3]

---

[1] Robinson, pp. 72 ff.; Conzelmann, p. 79; and Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 134.

[2] Luke 21:20-24. See Robinson, p. 79, and Creed, p. 253.

[3] Taylor, pp. 101 ff., thinks that a source in addition to Mark has been used to effect this change. See also L. Gaston, "Sondergut und Markusstoff," Theologische Zeitschrift, XVI (1960), 161-172.

[4] Robinson, pp. 72 ff.

Charles Talbert has argued convincingly that there are parallels between Luke 9:1-50 and Luke 22:7-23:16.[4] Talbert sees these parallels as the result of Luke's conscious manipulation of his sources. We shall observe the parallels which Talbert has pointed out as we proceed. These parallels are significant because if Luke has adapted the material of his Passion narrative in any way in order to show parallels between the Passion narrative and Luke 9:1-50, there is little place for the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Underlying the Proto-Luke hypothesis is the assumption that the Lucan Passion narrative had its structure prior to Luke's acquaintance with Mark (which is the source for Luke 9).

---

[1] Robinson, pp. 81 f. See Luke 21:24.

[2] Robinson, p. 82. Conzelmann, pp. 134 and 169.

[3] Most of the material in Luke 20 is Marcan. It is, however, used by Luke so as to undergird his overall purpose.

[4] Talbert, R. Exp., LXIV (1967), 492 ff.

The setting of the Last Supper in Luke is, as we have seen,[1] dependent on Mark. Both Luke and Mark present the Supper as a Passover meal. The meal is a frequent setting in Luke for an important discourse.[2] Flender has emphasized the parallel between this meal and the meal in Luke 14:1 ff.[3]

Luke has omitted the account of the anointing of Jesus by the woman at Bethany.[4] Conzelmann has suggested that the reason for this omission is that "he [Luke] is prepared to accept it, as in his variant in vii.36ff., only as a demonstration of love and as a sign of repentance."[5]

---

[1] See above, p. 136.

[2] Talbert, R. Exp., LXIV (1967), 493. Cf. Luke 9:10-17.

[3] Flender, p. 81.

[4] See above, p. 62 , for a discussion of the annointing in Luke 7:36-50.

[5] Conzelmann, p. 79.

M. Kiddle has proposed that Luke omitted the annointing at Bethany because it denoted for him a tragic element in the death of Jesus which is not emphasized by Luke.[1] Luke's interest in playing down the tragic aspect of the death of Jesus is also seen in the omission of Mark 15:34: ἐλωΐ ἐλωΐ λαμὰ σαβαχθάνι . . . εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με ; The Lucan εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου is much less despairing.[2]

As the Lucan narrative stands, the Last Supper (Luke 22:14-20) follows immediately after the account of the preparation (Luke 22:1-13). The context of the Supper is extended beyond the meal itself as it stands in Mark. The Supper is also the scene for the discourse of Luke 22:21-38. The discourse as a whole is reminiscent of the Farewell Discourse of John 13:31-17:26. Indeed, Jeremias has suggested: ". . . The farewell discourse motif (cf. Luke 22: 24-38) has been greatly expanded (John 13:31-17:26)."[3] Our purpose is to focus on the import of the discourse for Luke.

Conzelmann has suggested that the focus of the discourse is "the πειρασμός theme."[1] In keeping with Conzelmann's understanding of the divisions of the ministry of Jesus whereby the end of the "middle of time" comes with the return of Satan, Conzelmann sees the emphasis of the discourse as being a warning of the type of life which will characterize the epoch which is now dawning (Luke 22:36-- ἀλλὰ νῦν).

---

[1] M. Kiddle, "The Passion Narrative of St. Luke's Gospel," *J. T. S.*, XXXVI (1935), 274.

[2] See below, p. 232.

[3] Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, p. 100. The question of whether John is dependent on the same tradition or traditions which are embodied in brief in the Lucan discourse is beyond the scope of our study. See Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*, pp. 32-56.

We have already expressed our disagreement with Conzelmann concerning the end of the "middle of time."[2] The division of epochs comes only with the ascension. Thus, it seems that Conzelmann has put too much emphasis on the ἀλλὰ νῦν of Luke 22:36.[3] The warning is perhaps to be applied more immediately to the events of the betrayal, arrest and denial of Jesus. This should not, however, be done at the expense of denying, as Paul Minear seems to advocate,[4] that there is an important dimension of the Lucan discourse which prefigures the Church.[5] The account of the prediction of betrayal by Judas (Luke 22:21-23) provides the transition to

---

1. Conzelmann, p. 80.

2. See above, pp. 215 ff.

3. Cf. Minear, *Studies in Luke-Acts*, p. 124, and "A Note on Luke XXII. 36," *N. T.*, VII (1964), 128-134.

4. *Ibid*.

5. Flender, p. 83. Flender does not wish to separate the "ideal period" from the "present period" as does Conzelmann. He sees both of them as being a part of the life of the Church. This ambiguous state is reflected in Luke 22: 31-38.

the dispute about true greatness in Luke 22:24 ff. The climax of this dispute is the words of Jesus which begin with ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως (Luke 22:26). Thus the words of Luke 22:26-27 (ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος, καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν) seem to be intended as a pattern for the continuing life of the disciples. The tone of these verses, while reminiscent of Mark 10:43 f., is very similar to Luke 9:46 ff. where there is a dispute over greatness.[1] It also reminds us of the advice of Jesus in Luke 14:7-14. Jesus' own example (ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν) is the pattern which the twelve are to follow. That Luke has inserted this saying so late in the Gospel rather than reproducing Mark 10:41 ff. in the Marcan context supports its applicability for the continuing life of the disciples.

The saying on true greatness is followed in Luke 22:28-30 with a statement which looks back over the ministry of Jesus and also looks ahead to the future and the promise of an eschatological fulfillment. The past of Jesus' ministry is related to the future. Conzelmann has correctly emphasized the importance of the perfect participle διαμεμενηκότες in stressing the continuing way in which the disciples have followed Jesus.[1] The past becomes the basis of operation for the future. This is congruous with Luke's view of the Church throughout Luke-Acts. The promise, as well as what the disciples have experienced with Jesus, becomes the basis for the continuing life of the disciples in the Church. In this sense the Church is prefigured in the Lucan discourse at the Last Supper.

---

[1] Talbert, *R. Exp.*, LXIV (1967), 493.

Despite the prolepsis in the promise to the disciples, Jesus then begins to prepare them for the realities of the immediate future, as contrasted with the more distant future of the Church. The prediction of the denial by Peter is concrete and specific. Yet the warning of Luke 22:31-34 is not directed to Peter alone. The ὑμᾶς of verse 31 seems to imply the twelve as a whole.[2] The specific warning to Peter is not obliterated, as may be seen by the σοῦ and σύ of verse 32. Peter's confessional response of verse 33 has a close parallel in Luke 9:20.[3]

The problematic passage of verses 35-38 again addresses the group as a whole (καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς--verse 35).

---

[1] Conzelmann, p. 83. This also supports the emphasis which we have given to the journey motif in Luke.

Talbert, *R. Exp.*, XIV (1967), 483, sees a parallel between the clause οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμου ἐν τοις πειρασμοῖς μου and the exhortation in Luke 9:23: εἰ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

[2] F. J. Botha, "Ὑμᾶς in Luke xxii.31," *Exp. T.*, LXIV (1952), 125.

[3] Talbert, *R. Exp.*, LXIV (1967), 493, notes that both confessions by Peter follow a meal.

What is the intention of Luke in drawing the contrast between the instruction of verse 35 (which seems to have reference to Luke 9:5[1] and 10:4) and the advice of verse 36 (ἀλλὰ νῦν)? A change in tactics in carrying out the mission of the Church would hardly be introduced here, if our analysis of the earlier parts of the Gospel is correct. The pattern for the mission of the Church has already been established in the eyes of Luke by the deeds and words of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem. The admonition of verse 36 must, then, as Minear has suggested, apply more directly to the events of the immediate future.[2] Luke seems not so much to be advocating a pattern for the disciples to follow as pointing to the reality of the approaching events. Even the disciples will use swords in the events that follow (Luke 22:50). Thus, this pericope (verses 35-38) may provide the needed key for interpreting the whole of the discourse of Luke 22:21-38. There is an expression of both the ideal and the real. The role of the Church as servant, its sharing in God's kingdom and Jesus' praying for the disciples are not to be lost sight of even in the shadow of the climatic events of the last hours of Jesus' life.[3]

---

[1] Talbert, *R. Exp.*, LXIV (1967), 492.

[2] Minear, *N. T.*, VII (1964), 128 ff.

[3] Minear does not see that the Church is prefigured in the Lucan discourse. This may be because he has not looked at the discourse as a whole, or perhaps, he has reacted too strongly to Conzelmann.

Two factors are impressive in Luke 22:39. First, the clause ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν reflects the pattern of Jesus' stay in Jerusalem as presented by Luke 21:37: ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ηὐλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν. Secondly, reflected in the statement ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταί is a pattern which can be seen in much of the Gospel. The disciples follow after Jesus. This pattern is seen especially in the journey to Jerusalem.[1]

In the account of the agony on Mt. Olivet[2] (Luke 22:40-46) Luke has heightened the emphasis on πειρασμός by repeating the admonition (though in slightly different form) προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν in both verses 40 and 46. The intensity of Jesus' own testing, an emphasis which echoes Luke 22:28 (τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου), is also shown by the addition of verse 43-44. The marked contrast between Jesus and the disciples is seen in their sleeping during his agony. The fact of their sleeping also provides a parallel with Luke 9:28 ff. where the disciples are sleepy while Jesus is praying.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Robinson, pp. 43 ff., who emphasizes the way of the Lord as a major motif for the whole of the Third Gospel.

[2] Note that for Luke Gethsemane becomes Mt. Olivet. Again it is the mountain which is the place of prayer.

[3] Talbert, R. Exp., LXIV (1967), 493.

The account of the arrest of Jesus proves that Jesus was correct in his prediction of the disciples' reaction to his fate. They do use their swords.[1] Although Luke seems to be following Mark in verse 52b (ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων), the authorities have placed Jesus in such a role that he fulfills the prophecy cited in Luke 22:37: καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη . Jesus accepts this fate as the fulfillment of God's purpose. His statement, αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους , puts this event in the perspective of the fate which his lament over Jerusalem had foretold[2] (τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου --Luke 19:45).

The denial by Peter corresponds directly to the prediction of Jesus in Luke 22:31-34.[3] The mocking of Jesus by the soldiers presents further evidence that Jesus μετὰ ἀνομῶν ἐλογίσθη . The trial before the Sanhedrin which follows serves the same end. On the other hand, the trials before Pilate and before Herod avoid declaring that Jesus is guilty. Three times Pilate declares that he does not find that Jesus deserves to die.[4] Finally, without condemning him, Pilate delivered Jesus to the people (τὸν δὲ 'Ιησοῦν παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν --Luke 23:25). In this way Luke continues his political apologetic whereby little guilt is ascribed to Rome.[1]

---

[1] Talbert, R. Exp., LXIV (1967), 493. Talbert suggests that the miracle of restoring the ear of the slave of the high priest is parallel to the healing of the epileptic child in Luke 9:37-43a. This parallel is the weakest link in the chain of correlations which Talbert has shown to exist between Luke 9:1-50 and Luke 22:7-23:16.

[2] Robinson, pp. 80 ff.

[3] See Minear, N. T., VII (1964), 129 ff.

[4] Luke 23:5, 15, 22.

The trial before Herod is one of the elements in the Lucan narrative which is so different from Mark as to lead Taylor to the conclusion that Luke has followed a narrative other than Mark.[2] The trial before Herod is, however, but an isolated episode, which can be explained on the basis of Luke's theological interest. In the trial before Herod we have another occurrence of Luke's fulfillment of prophecy motif. By having Jesus appear before Herod, the prophecy of Psalm 2, which is quoted in Acts 4:25 f. as being prophetic of the Passion, is fulfilled. In the interpretation of Acts 4:27 Pilate and Herod are related and seem to be identified with the kinds of the earth and the rulers of Psalm 2:2. Whatever the origin of the account of the trial before Herod Luke has used it to fulfill the prophecy of Psalm 2 in both the Passion narrative and Acts.[3] Talbert has pointed out that the trial before Herod provides a Herod episode which is parallel to Mark 9:7-9.[4] The result is that there is a Herod episode in each of the stages of Jesus' ministry (Luke 9:7-9; 17:31 f.; and 23:6-16).

---

[1] Robinson, p. 82, and Conzelmann, p. 88.

[2] Taylor, pp. 52 ff.

[3] Creed, p. 280.

[4] Talbert, *R*. *Exp*., LXIV (1967), 493.

In the account of the journey to Calvary (Luke 23: 26-32), Lucan emphases can be seen. In verse 27 the witness motif is seen in the addition of the statement ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν . . . . Special attention is again given to the women who have been important witnesses since before Jesus left Galilee. The words of Jesus in response to the mourning of the women give further expression to the fate which is to befall Jerusalem, a Lucan emphasis which we have seen earlier in Luke 19:41-44; 21:5ff. and 22:53.

The text of Luke 23:34 is dubious. Yet, it is difficult to comprehend why it should have been omitted if it stood in the earliest text. The idea of compassion in this verse is certainly commensurate with the picture of Jesus as a compassionate person which is portrayed elsewhere in the Third Gospel.[1]

The change so that one of the thieves is repentant and Jesus extends hope to him is congruous with Luke's picture of Jesus as a person of compassion. This is closely related to the motif of forgiveness.[2] Beyond this observation we might suggest that the penitent thief provides a striking contrast with both the other thief and the whole of Jerusalem. This type of contrast is similar to the contrast between Zacchaeus in Luke 19:1 ff. and those who rejected Jesus.

---

[1] Walter Bowie, *The Compassionate Christ* (New York: Abingdon, 1965), pp. 298 f.

[2] *Ibid*.

The account of Jesus' death in the Third Gospel is presented much less as a picture of despair than in Mark. The contrast is at its greatest in the final words of Jesus. In Mark the words ἐλωῒ ἐλωῒ λαμὰ σαβαχθάνι seem to have been taken by Luke as a cry of despair.[1] It is replaced by Luke with the words πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου,[2] a cry which reflects more confidence and faith in the face of tragedy. The death of Jesus is the death of a martyr.[3] Yet, it is more than a martyr's death,[4] as may be seen by an examination of the kerygmatic statements of Acts 2:23; 3:15; 4:10; 5:30 and 10:39. Furthermore, the death of Jesus is no longer the occasion for the centurion to praise God as in Mark. The clause ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν is an alteration of Mark's ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν. While it appears to be an open question whether the indefinite υἱὸς θεοῦ is an ascription of divinity for Mark,[1] Luke avoids this possibility. The statement that Jesus is δίκαιος may be taken to be a further attempt by Luke to emphasize that Jesus is completely undeserving of death.[2] If so, the motif of Jesus' innocence is present here as well as throughout the scene of his trials. The motif of witness is present again in Luke 23:49: εἱστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁρῶσαι ταῦτα. The continuity of the witnesses from Galilee is maintained. Again special emphasis is given to the women as witnesses. Here Luke seems to be dependent on Mark, but his emphasis is congruous with his emphases elsewhere.

---

[1] Kiddle, _J_. _T_. _S_., XXXVI (1935), 274 ff.

[2] Cf. Psalm 31:5.

[3] Lightfoot, _History and Interpretation_, p. 176. The death of Jesus has become the pattern for the account of the death of the martyr Stephen in Acts 7:59. Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 88 ff.

[4] Kiddle, _J_. _T_. _S_., XXXVI (1935), p. 279, seems to suggest that the death of Jesus has no meaning except as a fulfillment of the plan of God. Such a suggestion too greatly minimizes the significance of the death of Jesus for Luke.

The account of the burial of Jesus in the Third Gospel concludes with a further emphasis on women who have followed from Galilee. They are witnesses to the very end. Luke prepares them to become witnesses also of the resurrected Lord: ὑποστρέψασαι δὲ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα καὶ μύρα (Luke 23:56a).

---

[1] Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan, 1952), p. 597.

[2] G. D. Kilpatrick, "A Theme of The Lucan Passion Story and Luke xxiii,47," J. T. S., XLIII (1942), 34-36. See also Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon, p. 195.

In view of the thorough and masterful work of Paul Schubert[1] in analyzing Luke 24, we need to do little more than to sketch the results of his study. We have already referred to the way in which Luke deals with the Marcan reference to Galilee in preparing the way for the resurrection appearances which are centered in Jerusalem.[2] We have also noted that for Luke the women become the first witnesses of the empty tomb and bear this news to the disciples (Luke 24:8 ff.).[3] Schubert has noted that the words of the messengers at the tomb go beyond the statement οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη.[4] Luke has the messengers repeat the words which Jesus spoke while he was still in Galilee (Luke 24:7), an addition, which with its emphasis on δεῖ, reflects the important Lucan motif of fulfillment of prophecy.[5] The reference to τοὺς ἀποστόλους in Luke 24:10 reflects a Lucan preference.[6] The contrast between τοὺς ἀποστόλους (= τοῖς ἕνδεκα in verse 9) and πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς heightens the significance of the use of ἀποστόλους. The reference to τοῖς λοιποῖς (and αἱ λοιπαί - verse 10) also emphasizes the presence of a body of witnesses other than the apostles, an idea which is underscored by the references in Luke 24:33 and 36. Thus, the availability of witnesses qualified to satisfy the criteria of Acts 1:21-22 is assured ahead of time by Luke.

---

[1] "Structure and Significance of Luke 24."

[2] See above, p. 133.

[3] See above, p. 134.

[4] Cf. Mark 16:6.

[5] Schubert, p. 168.

[6] See above, p. 109. See also Schubert, p. 168.

In Luke 24:13-53 Luke has brought together material which seems originally to have had little or no literary connection. Luke has brought the episodes of the Emmaus story and the appearance in Jerusalem together with the material in Luke 24:1-12 by his emphasis on the fulfillment of prophecy. Schubert has observed: "Luke pulls the three major items of his materials together by furnishing each of them with the same claims which we may briefly call 'the proof from prophecy' that Jesus is the Christ."[1] The climax of the story of the empty tomb lies for Luke in the words of the messengers:[2] . . . δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῆ τρίτη ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. In the Emmaus story the fulfillment of prophecy motif is dominant throughout. The peak of the expression of this motif is seen in verses 25-27: ὦ ἀνόηται καὶ βραδεῖς τῆ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται· οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διηρμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ . The climax of the appearance in Jerusalem lies in verses 44-46: οὗτος οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν , ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ ταῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ. τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῆ τρίτη ἡμέρα . The presence of the theme of fulfillment of prophecy, a theme common throughout the Third Gospel, supports the view that it is Luke who has united the material of this chapter. The manner in which the motif unites Marcan and non-Marcan material makes it improbable that this work belongs to a stage of Luke's literary activity prior to his knowledge of Mark.

---

[1] Schubert, p. 173.

[2] See above, p. 134.

The summary statement of Luke 24:19 reflects again the Lucan deed-word pattern. Luke has written with reference to Jesus: προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ.

Luke 24:47-48 (καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνα,--ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ. ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων)prepares the way for Acts where the Gospel is proclaimed to all the nations and those who have accompanied Jesus (οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ λοιποί) are witnesses.[1] The concluding verses of the Third Gospel (Luke

---

[1] That Jerusalem is the origin of the kerygma which is to be proclaimed is indicative that for Luke Jerusalem is not only a place of judgment--it is also a place of salvation.

24:50-53) emphasize a characteristically Lucan phenomenon of the praising of Jesus.[1] Three times in these verses the verb εὐλογεῖν is used. Furthermore, the final verse of the Gospel has the disciples in the temple. It is not by accident that the Gospel ends where it started, in the temple.[2] The temple is also the scene of much of the activity of the disciples in Acts. Thus, the way is prepared for Acts. The continuity extends not only from the beginning to the end of the Third Gospel, but also into the second part of the work of Luke.[3]

Summary

In this chapter we have attempted to view the Third Gospel as a literary unit. We have seen that special Lucan emphases and motifs transcend the divisions of Marcan and non-Marcan material. There is a distribution of Lucan redactions which suggests that the Gospel of Luke is a carefully planned literary work. The references and allusions of one section are dependent on preceding sections of the Gospel as it now stands. Frequently, references in a non-Marcan section appear to assume what has preceded in a Marcan portion of the Gospel. This does not suggest a work of two stages, even if by the same author. Furthermore, we have seen that when Luke has omitted Marcan material there is usually a perceivable reason for his doing so. We have been able to apprehend reasons for the inclusion of much of the non-Marcan material which Luke has used. The Gospel of Luke is a well planned and carefully executed literary unit.

---

[1] Minear, Studies in Luke-Acts, p. 116.

[2] See Luke 1:5 ff. Cf. Flender, p. 107, and Creed, p. 302.

[3] The temple is also an element of continuity from the epoch of Israel through the epoch of Jesus' ministry to the period of the Church.

When the observations of this chapter are seen together with our conclusions of the preceding chapter, namely, that Taylor has underestimated the extent of Luke's use of Marcan material and that the non-Marcan material of Luke does not provide a framework for the Gospel, there is hardly a place for the Proto-Luke hypothesis. The alternative view, that the Third Gospel is the work of an evangelist who, while using Mark as his framework and guide, has been free to adjust, rearrange, add, and delete materials in order to convey his own perspective, seems preferable.

Chapter IV

CONCLUSION

In a summary chapter Taylor brings together his arguments for the Proto-Luke hypothesis.[1] He states:

> It is not to be denied that the accepted theory that Mark provides the *Grundschrift* for Luke explains many of the facts within the Third Gospel, but the question is whether it explains all the facts, and whether indeed the facts which it does explain are not better accounted for by the Proto-Luke hypothesis.[2]

Taylor has enumerated seven factors which he feels establish the case for the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Taylor contends that these factors are best explained by the Proto-Luke hypothesis. In this chapter we shall consider these same seven factors and ask whether or not the alternative posed in the preceding chapter can explain these factors enumerated by Taylor as adequately as does the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Does the alternative that Mark provides the *Grundschrift* of Luke explain more facts than Taylor has acknowledged? The perspective for viewing the Third Evangelist has changed greatly since the days of Taylor's work on the Proto-Luke hypothesis. The advent of form criticism and Redaktionsgeschichte have provided a new perspective for viewing Luke. No longer can we see the Third Gospel primarily from the point of view of source material used. Increasingly Luke as an author and theologian demands our attention. This change in perspective has undoubtedly affected the way we understand the Third Gospel. This perspective is reflected in our analysis of Luke in the preceding chapter. Acknowledging the difference in perspective from which Taylor views the Third Gospel and from which we view it, we must examine the factors which Taylor has cited as confirming the case for Proto-Luke.

---

[1] Taylor, chapter VIII, "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis," pp. 182-215.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 182 ff.

1. "The analogy presented by the phenomena of the Passion and Resurrection narrative."

Taylor feels that the Lucan Passion and Resurrection narrative is so important for understanding Luke's use of sources that he has given priority to his analysis of the Lucan Passion narrative.[1] He sees Luke as having practically abandoned "the Markan source from the Supper onwards, inserting a few extracts only from this Gospel [Mark] into his independent account."[1] He has, then, used the results of his analysis of the Passion and Resurrection narrative as an analogy or paradigm for his analysis of the remaining portions of the Third Gospel. We have already seen that Taylor has underestimated the amount of Marcan material in the Passion narrative.[2] Thus, Taylor has used an analogy of questionable value in his analysis of the remaining portions of the Gospel. Further, Taylor's use of an analogy based on one portion of the Third Gospel assumes that it is necessary for Luke always to use his sources in the same way. We have seen that Luke has used his sources in whatever ways were necessary to meet his own theological and thematic interests. He has made redactions, additions and deletions wherever necessary without following a single observable pattern in terms of source. Further, we have seen that many phenomena of the Passion narrative can best be accounted for in terms of Lucan redactions, additions, and omissions on the basis of Mark as the Grundschrift for his narrative.

---

[1] Taylor, chapter II, "The Lukan Passion and Resurrection Narratives," pp. 33-75.

2. "The manner in which Mark is actually used."

Taylor emphasizes the fact that the Marcan material is distributed in "stripes."[3] This is a difficult phenomenon to apprehend. Yet, the Marcan material is not limited to "stripes" to the degree that Taylor has suggested. For example, the extensive occurrence of Marcan material in both Luke 3:1-4:30 and in the Passion narrative weakens the argument that Marcan material occurs only in "stripes."

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 183 ff.

[2] See above, pp. 107 ff.

[3] Taylor, p. 184. "Stripes" is the term used by Taylor.

Further, Taylor argues that Mark is not looked upon by Luke as the foundation of the Third Gospel. In our analysis of the portions of Luke attributed to Proto-Luke we have seen that the non-Marcan materials of the Third Gospel provide no framework of their own. What framework there is in Luke appears to be derived from Mark.[1] Despite the limitation in the use of Marcan material, Mark does provide the framework of Luke. Taylor has not made the needed distinction between where Luke is dependent on Mark for source material and where he is dependent on Mark for narrative framework. The view that Mark provides the Grundschrift for Luke more adequately takes into account this distinction and thereby more adequately describes the manner in which Mark is actually used by Luke.

3. "St. Luke's use of Q."

Taylor asserts:

> In the Third Gospel Q is used as the foundation of the narrative sections in which it appears. Fused

---

[1] See above, chapter II.

> with non-Markan matter and furnished with editorial passages, which include frequent references to the journeys of Jesus, Q stands apart from the Markan sections of the Gospel.[1]

Taylor is correct in his observation that in some sections Q combined with other non-Marcan material forms the foundation of the narrative in terms of the material from which the narrative is constructed. This is most obviously true in the central section of the Third Gospel. However, Taylor does not raise the question of the source of the framework in this section of the Gospel. It is just these "editorial passages, which include frequent references to the journeys of Jesus" that provide the narrative framework. We have seen that Luke has taken the motif of the journey from Mark and developed it into the framework of a large portion of the Gospel.[2] We have not been able to perceive that either Q or Luke's special material has provided the framework for any section of the Third Gospel. It is, therefore, misleading to refer to Q as the "foundation of the narrative sections in which it appears." The framework is too important to be overlooked in dealing with the question of the foundation of the narrative. The problem of the framework of the narrative in the sections of Luke in which Q is used is not resolved in a satisfactory manner by the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 185.

[2] See above,

4. "The relation of the Markan sections to the (presumed) continuous non-Markan source."

The first problem with which we must deal is the "(presumed) continuous non-Markan source." Taylor has stressed the continuous nature and unity of the non-Marcan material in Luke.[1] Yet, he has not succeeded in showing that the unity of the hypothetical Proto-Luke is more impressive--or even as impressive--as the unity of the Third Gospel as it now stands. Such a demonstration would seem to be the responsibility of one who is proposing the existence of a hypothetical document. Indeed, the unity of Proto-Luke is hardly as impressive as Taylor has suggested. The connections between the sections which Taylor has attributed to Proto-Luke are not as clear as he has proposed. He has pronounced the connection between Luke 3:1-4:30 and Luke 5:1-11 "a good one."[2] Objections may be raised at two points. First, in Luke 4:30 Jesus departs from Nazareth following his rejection by the people. His separation from them is forcefully conveyed. It is indeed strange that in the very next verse (Luke 5:1, if Proto-Luke is to be reconstructed) the people should be pressing upon him to hear the word of God. Second, in Luke 4:30 Jesus departs from Nazareth; in Luke 5:1 he is at Lake Gennesaret. While it may be quite natural for Jesus to go from Nazareth to Lake Gennesaret, the connection between Luke 4:30 and 5:1 is not as natural as the present order in the Gospel where Jesus has a more extended ministry in the area of Capernaum before the call of his disciples beside Lake Gennesaret.

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 164 ff.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 168.

Even Taylor acknowledges that the connection between Luke 5:11 and Luke 6:12 is abrupt. Taylor is, however, inclined to minimize this abruptness because there is "continuity in respect of subject matter."[1] The continuity of subject matter of which he speaks consists of the call of the three (Peter, James and John) and the call of the twelve. The abruptness of the transition from Luke 5:11 to 6:12 must not be taken so lightly. The present sequence of the Third Gospel has a more natural development with the ministry of Jesus providing the opportunity for the gathering of a larger group of intimate followers from which the twelve could be chosen as apostles. Again the proposed unity of the hypothetical Proto-Luke is less impressive than the unity of the Third Gospel as it stands.

Of the connection between Luke 8:3 and 9:51 Taylor says little except that the section Luke 6:12-8:3 ends with the same type of material as that with which Luke 9:51 ff. begins. He quotes Luke 8:1-3 and Luke 9:51 as proof. Both of these quotations are, however, the editorial work of Luke, and as such can be used in isolation to prove little either for or against the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Both Luke 8:1-3 and Luke 9:51 have been shown to embody motifs which are important for Luke in the Gospel as it now stands.[1]

---

[1] Taylor, p. 169.

Taylor sees the fact that both Luke 18:9-14 and 19:1-10 speak of a publican who is commended by Jesus as evidence for a connection between Luke 18:14 and 19:1 which is "of the happiest kind."[2] Taylor's work does not indicate that he has given sufficient consideration to the problem of narrative sequence and Jesus' movement toward Jerusalem. In Luke 17:11 Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem, but he is still far off: καὶ αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας . The next mention of the location of Jesus, if Proto-Luke is to be reconstructed, is in Luke 19:1: καὶ εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο τὴν Ἰεριχώ . How much more natural is the narrative sequence in the Gospel as it now stands![3] In Luke 18:31 Jesus is making progress toward Jerusalem, and in Luke 18:35 he is approaching Jericho before entering that city in Luke 19:1. In a discussion of the unity of portions of the Gospel of Luke, the narrative sequence must be taken into consideration along with the common theme of publicans who are commended by Jesus. Once more we fail to see an improvement over the present forms of the Gospel by looking at the unity of the hypothetical

---

[1] See above, pp. 177 f., 200.

[2] Taylor, p. 170.

[3] See above, p. 99.

Proto-Luke rather than viewing the Third Gospel as it stands.

The connection between Luke's account of the approach to Jerusalem (Luke 19:37-44, 47-48) and the preceding non-Marcan section is good. We have already observed, however, that there is not sufficient evidence to establish Taylor's case that Luke 19:37-44, 47-48 is non-Marcan.[1] Rather Luke 19:37-44, 47-48 is based on Marcan material and has been molded to express Luke's own interests.

The gap between Luke 19:48 and Luke 22:14 presents a sizable problem even for Taylor. To explain this gap he suggests that "something has fallen out, or been excised, from the non-Markan source."[2] This "something" has been replaced by the Marcan material which now appears in Luke 22:1-13.[3] The reason for this replacement, suggests Taylor, is to show that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. There is little reason to resort to such reasoning when we have already seen that the Passion narrative of Luke as a whole can not legitimately be called a non-Marcan section of the Third Gospel.[4]

In summary, the problem of the unity of sections of Luke which Taylor attributed to Proto-Luke is a greater problem than he has acknowledged. He has failed to demonstrate that the unity of the proposed Proto-Luke is an improvement over the present order of the Third Gospel. Without a unity of its own the hypothetical Proto-Luke is hardly the "Gospel-like" document that Taylor has claimed.

---

[1] See above, p. 97.

[2] Taylor, p. 178.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 179 f.

[4] See above, pp. 107 ff.

The second problem facing us is whether or not, as Taylor argues, "the Markan elements in Luke stand in a secondary relationship to it [the non-Marcan source]."[1] Marcan material, says Taylor, is used to supplement the deficiencies of the non-Marcan source. His argument presupposes the existence of "Q already expanded and interlaced with matter peculiar to Luke."[2] We have seen that in the very expansion of Q there is evidence for both acquaintance with and use of Mark. The framework employed in the expansion of Q is none other than the framework of Mark.[3] A source which provides the framework for Luke can hardly be relegated to a secondary status.

5. "The 'Markan Omissions' in their bearing on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis."

The omission of Marcan material is an important problem to which Taylor has given much attention.[4] He has cited forty-five passages from Mark which have been omitted by Luke.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 185.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[3] See above, pp. 50 ff., 56 f., 64 ff., 98 ff., and 136 ff.

[4] Taylor, pp. 135-143.

Of these Taylor admits that a large number of them can be explained on the basis of editorial reasons or because they do not appeal to the Third Evangelist.[1] Three categories remain for which Taylor perceives no explanation apart from the Proto-Luke hypothesis. We must consider each category.

a. "The 'Great Omission' (Mk. vi. 45-viii.26)." Taylor asserts that the Proto-Luke hypothesis explains this omission simply by saying that this section of Mark was not required by Luke.[2] Luke, he says, "was on the look-out for Galilean material."[3] We need not, however, assume the Proto-Luke hypothesis for this reasoning to be valid. We have seen above that the "great omission" is the result of Luke's intent to restrict the ministry of Jesus to Galilee until the beginning of the journey to Jerusalem.[4] A Galilean ministry is significant for Luke in the present form of the Third Gospel because it is the place for the beginning of Jesus' ministry and the place from which authentic witnesses come. The theme of witnesses pervades the whole of the Third Gospel, irrespective of boundaries between Marcan and non-Marcan material. The "great omission" can be understood in terms of Lucan interests without resorting to the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

---

[1] Taylor, pp. 137 ff.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 189.

[3] *Ibid*.

[4] See above, pp. 185 ff.

b. "Instances in which St. Luke has used Q and not Mk." There are a number of instances in which Luke has used Q instead of Mark. We have noted, however, that Taylor has too readily posited Luke's use of Q when Mark and Q appear to overlap in Luke 3:1-4:30.[1] In other cases Luke has used detached sayings from Q which could be more easily adapted to his purpose. Taylor, however, warns against resorting to this type of adaptation as an explanation for Luke's use of Q instead of Mark. He asserts:

> . . . If Mk. is St. Luke's primary source; the Evangelist must be credited with an editorial freedom of the most far-reaching kind, and we must have recourse to the most ingenious speculations to account for this literary process.[2]

The alternative to Proto-Luke which we have posed in Chapter III does, indeed, credit the Third Evangelist with a greater degree of editorial freedom than Taylor is willing to ascribe to him. There is a basic difference in the way Taylor views Luke as one who has faithfully reproduced his sources and our view of Luke as a creative author and theologian who has used considerable editorial freedom. We, too, are reluctant to take recourse to "ingenious speculations." Yet, in accounting for the disuse of Mark we have frequently suggested that Luke has exercised editorial freedom.

c. "Other Markan Passages, mainly Narratives in respect of which preference has been given to Non-Markan Versions." With reference to the narratives which have been disregarded by Luke in favor of non-Marcan versions, let us note two things. First, in several instances, the non-Marcan versions of which Taylor speaks reflect Lucan emphases so that it is not always clear whether Luke has used a non-Marcan version or whether he has adapted the Marcan version.[1] Second, at times when he has used genuinely non-Marcan versions, he has done so because the non-Marcan material more clearly reflected his own interests.[2] Inasmuch as many omissions of Marcan material have been explained in chapter III of our work on the basis of Lucan emphases and interests, the problem of the omission of Marcan material is not as foreboding as Taylor has suggested. The view that Luke has exercised a high degree of editorial freedom in his use of Mark is an alternative which makes the Proto-Luke hypothesis unnecessary as a basic explanation for the overall problem of the omission of Marcan materials.[3]

---

[1] See above, pp. 38 ff.

[2] Taylor, p. 191.

6. "Phenomena within the Third Gospel which are explained by the Proto-Luke Theory."

a. "The opening of Luke iii." That Luke 3:1-2 ever stood as the beginning of a gospel like Proto-Luke is by no means certain. Nor do we need to assume that these verses stood in such a position to understand the sixfold synchronism which they present. This sixfold synchronism is best understood in light of Luke's theological understanding of history and the division of salvation history into three epochs. The sixfold synchronism designated the point in history at which the important "middle of time" begins. The beginning of the epoch of Jesus' ministry coincides with his baptism by John. To avoid interrupting the story of Jesus' baptism, Luke has placed this series of synchronisms at the beginning of the brief account of John's ministry.[1]

---

[1] See, for example, Luke 6:12-19 and 19:36-38.

[2] See, for example, Luke 4:16-30. There is, however, evidence that Luke has added some distinctively Lucan features to this non-Marcan account of the rejection at Nazareth.

[3] This is not to say that we have adequately accounted for every omission of Marcan material, but neither does the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

b. "The Position of the Lukan Genealogy." Both Streeter and Taylor have suggested that Luke 3:23-38 is the natural place for the genealogy in Proto-Luke, for it follows immediately the introduction of Jesus into the story as presented by Proto-Luke (Luke 3:21-22).[2] We have seen, however, that the position of the Lucan genealogy fits well into the present structure of the Third Gospel. The baptism of Jesus marks the beginning of his ministry and, thus, the beginning of the new epoch. It is appropriate at the beginning of this epoch that the identity of Jesus be established, and the Lucan genealogy serves this end.[3] The Proto-Luke hypothesis

---

1. See above, p. 157.

2. Streeter, p. 209, and Taylor, pp. 147, 194. See above,

3. See above, pp. 161 f.

is not necessary to explain the location of the genealogy in Luke.

c. "The order in which Mark is reproduced." Taylor argues: "The Proto-Luke theory also accounts for the fidelity with which the order of Mk. is reproduced in the Third Gospel."[1] Taylor suggests that "extracts" were taken from Mark and inserted into Proto-Luke in the order in which they occurred in Mark. This reflects, suggests Taylor, that Luke has had "direct reference to the original source [Mark]"[2] in making the insertions. The order of the Marcan material indicates no more for Taylor than that Luke has simply gone through the Gospel of Mark in choosing material to be inserted. The alternative that the reason for Luke's fidelity to the order of Mark is that Mark provides the basic framework for the Third Gospel is just as possible as Taylor's suggestion. The fact that we have seen that there is little evidence of a framework in the Third Gospel other than that provided by Mark, and the idea and motifs embodied therein, makes this alternative decidedly preferable to the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

d. "The Position given to the Sermon at Nazareth." The position of Luke 4:16-30 is, according to Taylor, the result of its being an "integral part of a non-Markan source."[3]

---

[1] Taylor, p. 195.

[2] Taylor, "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: Methods of Gospel Criticism," Exp. T., LXXI (1959), 70.

[3] Taylor, p. 142.

Yet, at another point, Taylor says:

> It is not accident that the first detailed story of the Galilean ministry, as it is told in the Third Gospel, throws into the foreground the thought of God as the God of Gentiles as well as Jews, as the Friend of sinners, the Healer of the broken-hearted, the Giver of light. The story also pictures in the most vivid way the hostility awakened by preaching first greeted with so much eagerness and delight.[1]

There is no need to resort to the Proto-Luke hypothesis in order to understand the pericope of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth in terms very much like those used by Taylor in the above quotation. We, too, have seen that Luke 4:16-30 embodies motifs that are typical of Luke as a whole.[2] This pericope provides a frontispiece for the Lucan presentation of the entire ministry of Jesus. The ideas, motifs and emphases presented here are characteristic not only of non-Marcon portions of Luke, but of the Gospel as a whole and of Acts.

e. "The 'great interpolation.'" With reference to this section of the Third Gospel Taylor says: "As an integral part of Proto-Luke, Lk. ix. 51-xviii.14 is much more naturally accounted for than by the view that it is a section interpolated into the Markan framework."[3] In our analysis of the

---

[1] Taylor, p. 148.

[2] See above, pp. 164 ff.

[3] Taylor, p. 195.

"great interpolation"[1] we have made several observations: (1) The references to the journey to Jerusalem are not native to the materials of which the section is constructed. (2) The references to the journey belong to transitional statements which seem to be the editorial work of Luke. (3) There is a journey to Jerusalem in Mark. (4) We know that Luke used Mark for at least parts of the Third Gospel. Luke seems to have taken from Mark the motif of the journey to Jerusalem and made it into the framework for a lengthy section of the Third Gospel. This section (Luke 9:51-18:14) plays an important part in the present structure of Luke-Acts in that the journey section provides a section of teaching which prepares the Church for its journey in Acts. The "great interpolation" is best understood in relation to the present structure of Luke-Acts without resorting to the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

f. "The Position assigned to the story of the Cure of the Blind Man at Jericho (Luke xviii.33-43=Mk. x.46-52)." Luke has altered the location of the cure of the blind man at Jericho so that it is no longer ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰεριχώ as in Mark 10:46. Luke notes ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεριχώ (Luke 18:35). Taylor suggests: "It would be a rash inference to suggest that purely literary considerations have led to an arbitrary treatment of Mk."[2] We must note, however, that Luke has two stories which are related to Jericho, the cure of the blind man and the story of Zacchaeus. The manner in which he has dealt with them need not be classed as arbitrary. He has simply molded his material so that he is able to incorporate both into his narrative. Thus, he reports one of the stories while Jesus is approaching Jericho and the other while he is departing. That the story of Zacchaeus has caused Luke to alter the reporting of the Marcan episode is not evidence for a non-Marcan narrative. The Zacchaeus story is but an isolated episode which in itself can not be taken as evidence for or against Proto-Luke.[1]

---

[1] See above, pp. 193 ff.

[2] Taylor, p. 146.

g. "The Implications of St. Luke's Preface." Taylor suggests that Luke's preface (Luke 1:1-4) implies a work, the nature of which is in complete harmony with the Proto-Luke hypothesis.[2] This is perhaps true. Yet, even Taylor attributes Luke 1-2 to a stage of Luke's literary activity later than Proto-Luke.[3] He places it at a stage after Mark was employed by the Third Evangelist. The Proto-Luke hypothesis is not the only literary solution which is in complete harmony with the implications of Luke's preface. The same might be said for the alternative suggestion that Luke has used Mark as the Grundschrift for the Third Gospel. In the final analysis, the words of the preface provide little support for either the Proto-Luke hypothesis or the alternative view which we have proposed. It presents no evidence which contradicts either alternative.

---

[1] See above, p. 97.

[2] Taylor, p. 148.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 164 ff.

7. "The agreement of the theory with all that we know of the Evangelist's literary method, and in particular with his use of the 'We-Sections' in the Acts."

Taylor asserts:

> We know nothing of the Evangelist's methods beyond what we can learn from the Gospel itself and the Acts. These works, however, do reveal to critical research some of the secrets of their author's craftsmanship, and it is reassuring to find that his methods are in complete accord with what is implied in the Proto-Luke Hypothesis itself.[1]

This same argument may be used in support of our view that the Gospel of Mark provides the Grundschrift for Luke. Indeed, we have devoted the whole of chapter III to an attempt to demonstrate that the present structure is congruous with the Evangelist's literary method and theology in the whole of Luke-Acts.

Taylor stresses the orderly progression of the narrative to Jerusalem in the Gospel and from Jerusalem in Acts as a chief consideration of the Third Evangelist. This orderly progression, he says, is "the chief consideration" in Proto-Luke.[2] Such a superlative statement is difficult to substantiate or to refute. We may suggest, however, that in the present form of Luke-Acts, this same orderly progression is an impressive phenomenon. We do not need to resort to the Proto-Luke hypothesis to explain its presence.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 199.

[2] Ibid.

There are similarities between the Gospel of Luke and the "we-sections" of Acts. Taylor enumerates some of these. "Both are travel-documents, and both are rich in miracle stories. Each contains a story of the raising from the dead and a farewell address. Each has a city as its goal. . . ."[1] Taylor then suggests that these parallels are the result of the Gospel of Luke's having been modeled after the "we-sections." May not the reverse of this also be true? Is it not possible that the Gospel of Luke in its present form has provided the pattern for the last chapters of Acts? This possibility has recently been suggested by Paul Schubert.[2] In light of the fact that Acts follows the pattern set forth in Luke in sections other than the "we-sections," it is reasonable to believe that it is the Gospel which has provided the literary pattern for Acts throughout and not conversely. If this argument is accepted as reasonable, it is unnecessary to resort to the Proto-Luke hypothesis in order to explain the parallels between the "we-sections" of Acts and portions of the Third Gospel.

---

[1] Taylor, p. 200.

[2] Paul Schubert, "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts," J. B. L., LXXXVII (1968), 1-16.

Our review of the factors which Taylor has asserted support the case for Proto-Luke has left us with the impression that the Proto-Luke hypothesis is not the only explanation for these several factors. Indeed, we have suggested that the Proto-Luke hypothesis is not even the best explanation for some of the factors enumerated by Taylor. Certainly the Proto-Luke hypothesis does not account for all the facts of the Third Gospel. In chapter II of our work we have suggested that Taylor has underestimated the extent of the Marcan material in the sections of the Third Gospel attributed to Proto-Luke. Furthermore, the absence of a narrative framework in Luke other than that which the Third Evangelist has taken from Mark, either overtly or by suggestion, calls into serious question the basic assumption that the sections attributed to Proto-Luke were ever a connected narrative. When this observation is seen together with the even distribution of Lucan motifs and emphases throughout the Gospel in its present form, a matter which we have attempted to substantiate in chapter III, we conclude that the Proto-Luke hypothesis is unnecessary. Given the present literary structure of the Third Gospel with its unity of plan and theological perspective, there is little reason to suggest that this Gospel is the product of two stages of the literary productivity of its author. Indeed, the alternative view that Mark has provided the Grundschrift for the Gospel of Luke is preferable. The Third Gospel is the work of an evangelist, who while using Mark as his framework and guide, has been free to adjust, rearrange, add, and delete materials in order to convey his own theological perspective.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adeney, W. F. *St. Luke*. ("Century Bible.") New York: Frowde Press, n. d.

Aland, Kurt, *et al*. (eds.). *The Greek New Testament*. New York: American Bible Society, 1966.

Albright, W. F. *New Horizons in Biblical Research*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Andersen, Donald. "The Christology of Luke's Gospel." Unpublished Th. D. dissertation. Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1957.

Anderson, Hugh. "Broadening Horizons: The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Luke 4:16-30 in Light of Recent Critical Trends," *Interpretation*, XVIII (1964), 259-275.

Arndt, William. *Bible Commentary: The Gospel According to St. Luke*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956.

Bailey, John A. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John* (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, VII). Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Balmford, M. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

Baltzer, K. "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings," *Harvard Theological Review*, LVIII (1953), 263-277.

Barclay, William. *The First Three Gospels*. London: S. C. M. Press, 1966.

Barr, Allan. *A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, n. d.

________. "The Use and Disposal of the Marcan Source in Luke's Passion Narrative," *Expository Times*, LV (1943-1944), 227-231.

Barrett, Charles K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: S. P. C. K., 1947.

________. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* ("A. S. Peake Memorial Lectures," 6). London: Epworth Press, 1961.

________. "Luke xxii.15: To Eat the Passover," *Journal of Theological Studies*, IX (1958), 305-307.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and adapted from the 4th revised edition by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Bauman, Edward W. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

Bea, Augustin. *The Study of the Synoptic Gospels: New Approaches and Outlooks*. Edited by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Beare, Francis Wright. *The Earliest Records of Jesus*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.

Betz, Otto. "The Kerygma of Luke," *Interpretation*, XXII (1968), 131-146.

Bishop, Eric F. F. "Local Colour in Proto-Luke," *Expository Times*, XLV (1933-1934), 151-156.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised from the 9th and 10th edition by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blevins, James L. "The Passion Narrative," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (1967), 513-522.

Blinzler, J. "Die literarische Eigenart das Sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukas," *Synoptische Studien für A. Wikenhauser*. München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1953, 20-41.

________. *The Trial of Jesus, the Jewish and Roman Proceedings against Jesus Christ described and assessed from the oldest accounts*. Translated by Isabel and Florence McHugh. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1959.

Borgen, Peder J. "Eschatology and 'Heilsgeschichte' in Luke-Acts." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Drew University, 1956.

________. "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," *New Testament Studies*, V (1958), 282-307.

Bornkamm, Günther, Gerhard Barth and Heinz Joachim Held. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Translated by Percy Scott. ("The New Testament Library.") Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

Botha, F. J. "Ὑμᾶς in Luke xxii.31," *Expository Times*, XLIV (1952-1953), 125.

Bowie, Walter Russell. *The Compassionate Christ: Reflections from the Gospel of Luke*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Braumann, G. "Die lukanische Interpretation der Zerstörung Jerusalems," *Novum Testamentum*, VI (1963), 120-127.

Brown, J. P. "An Early Revision of the Gospel of Mark," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 215-227.

________. "Mark as Witness to an Edited Form of Q," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXX (1961), 29-44 ff.

Bruce, F. F. *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960.

Bultmann, Rudolf K. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.

________. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribner, 1951.

________. "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte," *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.

Burkitt, F. Crawford. *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*. London: Constable and Company, 1922.

________. *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907.

Burton, E. D. *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904.

Bussmann, Wilhelm. *Synoptic Studien*. *III*. *Zu den Sonderquellen*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1931.

Butler, Christopher. "St. Luke's Debt to St. Matthew," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXII (1939), 237-308.

Cadbury, Henry J. *The Book of Acts in History*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

________. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1927.

________. "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface," *Expositor*, series 8, vol. XXI (1921), 431-449.

________. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. *I*. *The Diction of Luke and Acts*. *II*. *The Treatment of Sources in the Gospel*. ("Harvard Theological Studies," VI.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919 (I), 1920 (II).

Cadoux, Cecil J. *The Life of Jesus*. West Drayton: Penguin Books, [1948].

Caird, G. B. *The Gospel of St. Luke* ("Penguin Gospel Commentaries.") Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964.

________. "Jesus and the End," *Expository Times*, LXXVII (1965), 78.

Cerfaux, L. "A propos des sources du troisième evangile: Proto-Luc ou Proto-Mattieu?," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, XII (1935), 5-27.

Chapman, John [Henry Palmer Chapman]. *The Four Gospels*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1944.

Clark, K. W. "Realized Eschatology," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIX (1946), 367-383.

Coffin, C. P. "Two Sources for the Synoptic Account of the Last Supper," *Anglican Theological Review*, V (1901), 102-116.

Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. ("Handbuch zum Neuen Testament," 7.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1963.

________. "Gegenwart und Zukunst in der synoptischen Tradition." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LIV (1957), 277-296.

________. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell from the 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

________. "Zur Lukasanalyse," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, XLIX (1952), 16-33.

Creed, J. M. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1930.

________. "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems: 'L' and the Structure of the Lucan Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1934-1935), 101-107.

________. "The Supposed 'Proto-Lucan' Narrative of the Trial before Pilate: A Rejoinder," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1934-1935), 378-379.

Crompton, R. H. *The Synoptic Problem and a New Solution*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902.

Davies, J. G. "The Prefigurement of the Ascension in the Third Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies*, VI (1955), 229-233.

Davies, J. H. "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," *Studia Evangelica*, II (1964), ("Texte und Untersuchungen," 87.), 164-169.

Davies, William D. *Invitation to the New Testament: A Guide to its Main Witnesses*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Daube, David. "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," *New Testament Studies*, V (1958-1959), 174-187.

Denney, James. *The Death of Christ*. New York: American Tract Society, 1903.

Dibelius, Martin. *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

________. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

________. "The Structure and Literary Character of the Gospels," *Harvard Theological Review*, XX (1927), 151-170.

________. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Mary Ling and Paul Schubert. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.

Dickie, Edgar P. "The Third Gospel: A Hidden Source," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1934-1935), 326-330.

Dodd, Charles H. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Nisbet and Company, 1952.

________. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.

________. "Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abominations' of Desolation," *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXVII (1937), 47-54.

________. "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative," *Expository Times*, XLIII (1931-1932), 396-400.

________. *The Present Task in New Testament Studies*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1936.

Easton, Burton S. *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and other Papers*. Edited by F. C. Grant. Greenwich, Connecticut: Seabury Press, 1954.

________. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

________. "Linguistic Evidence for the Lucan Source L," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXIX (1910), 139-180.

________. "The Special Source of the Third Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXX (1911), 78-103.

Ehrhardt, Arnold. "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles," *Studia Theologica*, XII (1958), 45-79.

Ellis, E. E. "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," *New Testament Studies*, XII (1965), 27-41.

Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," *Studies in the Gospels, Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955, pp. 37-54.

Evans, D. E. "Synoptic Criticism since Streeter," *Expository Times*, LXXII (1960-1961), 295-299.

Farmer, William R. "Notes on a Literary and Form Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Materials Peculiar to Luke," *New Testament Studies*, VIII (1961), 301-316.

________. "A 'Skeleton in the Closet' in Gospel Research," *Biblical Research*, VI (1961), 18-42.

________. *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Feine, Paul and Johannes Behm. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Completely re-edited by Werner Georg Kümmel. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Finlayson, S. K. "'The Enigma of the Sword,'" *Expository Times*, L (1938-1939), 563.

Flender, Helmut. *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Translated by Isle and Reginald Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. *The Acts of the Apostles*. ("The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.") New York: Harper and Row, 1931.

________ and Kirsopp Lake. *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. II. London: Macmillan and Company, 1922.

Fournier, W. J. "The Third Gospel: A Hidden Source," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1933-1934), 928.

Fuller, Reginald H. *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1966.

________. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. New York: Scribner, 1965.

________. *Luke's Witness to Jesus Christ*. ("World Christian Books," No. 26.) New York: Association Press, 1958.

________. *The New Testament in Current Study*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

Gaston, L. "Sondergut und Markusstoff in Lk. 21," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XVI (1960), 161-172.

Geldenhuys, Norval. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.

George, Augustin. "Tradition et redaction chez Luc. La construction du troisième Evangile," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, XLIII (1967), 100-129.

Gilmour, S. MacLean. "A Critical Re-examination of Proto-Luke," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 143-152.

________. "The Gospel According to St. Luke" (Introduction and Exegesis), The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953, VIII, 3-434.

Girard, L. L'evangile des voyages de Jésus, ou la section 9, 51-18, 14 de Saint Luc. Paris: L. Gabalda, 1951.

Goguel, Maurice. "Luke and Mark: With a Discussion of Streeter's Theory," Harvard Theological Review, XXVI (1933), 1-56.

Gollwitzer, Helmut. Jesu Tod und Auferstchung: Nach dem Bericht des Lukas. München: Kaiser Verlag, 1953.

Goulder, M. D. and M. L. Sanderson. "St. Luke's Genesis," Journal of Theological Studies, VIII (1957), 12-30.

Gouldoever, W. K. "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel," Novum Testamentum, VIII (April-October, 1966), 111-123.

Grant, F. C. "A Critique of the Style and Literary Method of Luke," Anglican Theological Review, II (1919-1920), 318-323.

________. The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Grant, Robert M. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Grobel, Kendrick. Formgeschichte und synoptische quellenanalyse. ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," Neue Folge, 35. Heft.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1937.

Grundmann, W. "Fragen der Komposition des Lukanischen Reiseberichts," Zeitschrift fur Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, L (1959), 252-270.

Haenchen, Ernst. Die Apostelgeschichte. 10. Auflage. (H. A. W. Meyer's "Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentator über das Neue Testament.") Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

________. *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus Evangelium und der kanonischen Parallelen (Sammlung Töpelmann, zweite Reihe, Band 6.)* Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.

Haik, Paul S. "The Argument of the Gospel of Luke." Unpublished Th. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1965.

Hannam, Wilfred. *Luke the Evangelist: A Study of His Purpose*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1935.

Hanson, R. P. C. "Does δίκαιος in Lk. xxiii. 47 Explode the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Expository Times*, LV (1943-1944), 52-53.

Harnack, Adolf. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. ("Crown Theological Library," 23.) New York: Putnam, 1908.

Harrison, Everett F. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Hastings, Adrian. *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teachings of St. Luke*. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1958.

Hauck, Friedrick. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* 2. neubearbeitate Auflage von Walter Grundmann. ("Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament," Vol. III.) Berlin: Evangelische Verlanganstalt, [1961].

Hawkins, John C. "The Disuse of the Marcan Source in St. Luke ix.51-xviii.14," *Expository Times*, XIV (1899-1900), 90-93, 137-140.

________. "St. Luke's Passion Narrative Considered with Reference to the Synoptic Problem," *Expository Times*, XV (1903-1904), 122-126, 273-276.

Headlam, Arthur C. *The Life and Teaching of Jesus*. London: John Murray, 1924.

Henshaw, T. *New Testament Literature: In Light of Modern Scholarship*. London: George Allen&Unwin, 1952.

Herrmann, Ingo. *Encounter with the New Testament: an Initiation*. Translated by Raymond Meyerpeter. New York: J. P. Kenedy, 1965.

Holtzmann, Heinrich J. *Die Synoptischen Evangelium*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863.

Hobart, W. K. *The Medical Language of St. Luke* ("Dublin University Press Series.") Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Company, 1882.

Huck, Albert. *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*. 9th edition revised by Hans Lietzmann. English edition by Frank L. Cross. New York: American Bible Society, 1935.

Hunkin, J. W. "The Composition of the Third Gospel, with Special Reference to Canon Streeter's Theory of Proto-Luke," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXVIII (1926-1927), 250-262.

Hunter, Archibald M. *Interpreting the New Testament, 1900-1950*. London: S. C. M. Press, 1951.

———. *Introducing New Testament Theology*. London: S. C. M. Press, 1957.

Jameson, H. G. *The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1922.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated from the 3rd edition by Norman Perrin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.

———. *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. ("Studies in Biblical Theology.") London: S. C. M. Press, 1958.

Johnson, Sherman. *The Theology of the Gospels*. ("Studies in Theology," 56.) London: Duckworth, 1966.

Johnston, Wendell Graham. "The Soteriology of the Book of Acts." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1961.

Jones, Donald L. "The Christology of the Missionary Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1966.

Keck, Leander E. "Jesus' Entrance Upon His Mission," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (1967), 465-484.

________. *Mandate to Witness. Studies in the Book of Acts.* Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1964.

________ and J. Louis Martyn, editors. *Studies in Luke-Acts.* New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Kee, Howard C., Franklin W. Young and Karlfried Fröhlich. *Understanding the New Testament.* 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

Kiddle, M. "The Passion Narrative of St. Luke's Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVI (1935), 267-280.

Kilpatrick, G. D. "Scribes, Lawyers, and Lucan Origins," *Journal of Theological Studies*, I (1950), 56-60.

________. "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story Luke xxiii.47," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLIII (1942), 34-36.

King, N. O. "The 'Universalism' of the Third Gospel," *Studia Evangelica* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, 73). Edited by Kurt Aland *et al*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 199-205.

Knox, Wilfred L. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels.* 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1953 (I), 1957 (II).

Koch, Klaus. *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese.* Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1964.

Koh, Roland. *The Writings of St. Luke.* Hong Kong: The Diocesan Literature Committee, 1953.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Das Neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme.* ("Orbis Academicus: Problemgeschichten der Wissenschaft in Dokumenten und Darstellungen.") München: Verlag Karl Alber Frieburg, 1958.

Lagrange, M. J. *Évangile selon Saint Luc* ("Études Bibliques.") Paris: J. Gabalda, 1948.

________. "Les sources du troisième évangile," *Revue Biblique*, IV (1895), 5-22 and V (1896), 5-38.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," *Studies in the Gospels.* Edited by D. E. Nineham. London: Basil Blackwell, 1955, pp. 159-200.

________. "The Lukan Portrait of Christ," *New Testament Studies*, II (1956), 166-175.

________. "Luke." *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Revised edition by Matthew Black. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.

Laurentin, René. *Structure et Theologie de Luc I-II*. (Études Bibliques.") Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957.

Leaney, A. R. C. "The Birth Narratives in St. Luke and St. Matthew," *New Testament Studies*, VIII (1962), 158-166.

________. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

________. "The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv.12-53)," *New Testament Studies*, II (1955), 110-114.

Lightfoot, Robert H. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. ("The Bampton Lectures," 1934.) London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

________. *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.

Lindsey, R. L. "A Modified Two-Document Theory of the Synoptic Dependence and Interdependence," *Novum Testamentum*, VI (1963), 239-263.

Linton, A. "The Trial of Jesus and the Interpretation of Ps.CX," *New Testament Studies*, VII (1960-1961), 258-262.

Lockton, W. *Certain Alleged Gospel Sources: A Study of Q, Proto-Luke and M*. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1927.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Galiläa und Jerusalem*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1936.

Lohse, Edward. *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi im Zeugnis des Lukasevangelium*. (*Biblische Studien*, Beihefte 31.) Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.

________. "Lukas als Theologie der Heilsgeschichte," *Evangelische Theologie*, XIV (1954), 256-275.

Luce, H. K., editor. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. ("Cambridge Greek Testament.") Cambridge: University Press, 1949.

Lummis, E. W. *How Luke Was Written*. Cambridge: University Press, 1915.

McArthur, H. K. "Basic Issues: A Survey of Recent Gospel Criticism," Interpretation, XVIII (1964), 39-55.

McCool, F. J. "Revival of Synoptic Source-Criticism," Theological Studies, XVII (1956), 459-493.

McCown, C. C. "Gospel Geography: Fiction, Fact and Truth," Journal of Biblical Literature, LX (1941), 1-25.

McEachern, Vernon E. "Dual Witness and Sabbath Motif in Luke," Canadian Journal of Theology, XII (1966), 267-280.

Macgregor, G. H. C. "The Acts of the Apostle" (Introduction and Exegesis), The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953, IX, 1-352.

Manson, Thomas Walter. "Life of Jesus: A Survey of Available Material. (3) Work of St. Luke," Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XXVIII (1944), 382-403.

________. The Sayings of Jesus. Originally Part II of The Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 300-639, by H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson and C. J. Wright. London: I. Nicholson and Watson, 1939. Published separately as The Sayings of Jesus. London: S. C. M. Press, 1949.

________. The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content. Cambridge: University Press, 1931.

Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke. ("The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.") London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.

Mattill, Andrew Jacob, Jr. "Luke as Historian in Criticism since 1840." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1959.

________ and Mary B. Mattill. A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles. ("New Testament Tools and Studies," VII.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Metzger, Bruce M. Index to Periodic Literature on Christ and the Gospels. ("New Testament Studies," VI.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

________. The New Testament: Its Background, Growth and Content. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Bern: Buchdruckerei F. Graf-Lehmann, 1946.

Minear, P. S. "A Note on Luke xxii·36," *Novum Testamentum*, VII (1964), 128-134.

Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. 3rd edition. ("International Theological Library.") New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.

Montefiore, C. G. *The Synoptic Gospels*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Company, 1927.

Montefiore, Hugh W. "Does 'L' Hold Water?," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XII (1961), 59-60.

Morgenthaler, Robert. *Die Lukanische Geschichtschreibung als Zeugnis*. 2 Teile. ("Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments," 14, 15.) Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949.

_______. *Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*. Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958.

Morton, A. Q. and G. H. C. Macgregor. *The Structure of Luke and Acts*. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden, editors. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1899.

Napier, T. M. "The Enigma of the Swords," *Expository Times*, IXC (1938), 467-470.

Navone, John. "The Way of the Lord," *Scripture*, XX (1968), 24-30.

Neill, Stephen. *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Neirynck, F. "La rédaction mathéenne et la structure du premier Evangile," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, XLIII (1967), 41-73.

Nesbitt, Charles F. "The Bethany Traditions in the Gospel Narratives," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXIX (1961), 119-124.

Nestle, Eberhard, editor. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 24 Auflage revised by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1960.

Oliver, H. H. "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," *New Testament Studies*, X (1964), 202-226.

O'Neill, John C. "The Six Amen Sayings in Luke," *Journal of Theological Studies*, X (1959), 1-9.

________. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. London: S. P. C. K., 1961.

Ott, Wilhelm. *Gebet und Heil: die Bedeutung der Gebetsparanese en der lukanischen Theologie*. ("Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament," XII.) München: Kösel-Verlag, 1965.

Packer, J. W. *Acts of the Apostles*. ("The Cambridge Bible Commentary.") Cambridge: University Press, 1966.

Parker, Pierson. "A Proto-Lukan Basis for the Gospel According to the Hebrews," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIX (1940), 471-478.

Parsons, Ernest William. *A Historical Examination of Some Non-Markan Elements in Luke*. ("Historical and Linguistic Studies," Second series, II.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924.

Patton, Carl S. *Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. ("University of Michigan Studies: Humanistic Series," V.) New York: Macmillan Company, 1915.

Perry, Alfred M. "An Evangelist's Tabellae: Some Sections of Oral Tradition in Luke," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLVIII (1929), 206-233.

________. "A Judaeo-Christian Source in Luke," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIX (1930), 181-194.

________. "'Proto-Luke' and the 'Chicago Theory' of the Synoptic Problem," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLVII (1928), 91-116.

________. "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems: V. Luke's Disputed Passion Narrative," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1934-1935), 256-260.

________. *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*. ("Historical and Linguistic Studies.") Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1920.

Petrie, C. Stewart. "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Expository Times*, LIV (1942-1943), 172-177.

________. "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis: Observations on Dr. Vincent Taylor's Rejoinder," *Expository Times*, LV (1943-1944), 52-53.

Piper, Otto A. "The Origin of the Gospel Pattern," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 115-124.

———. "The Purpose of Luke," *Union Seminary Magazine*, LVII (1945-1946), 15-25.

Pliny. *The Natural History of Pliny*. Translated with copious notes by John Bostock and H. T. Riley. 5 vols. ("Bohn's Classical Library.") London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855.

Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. ("International Critical Commentary.") New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

Prevallet, Elaine Maire. "The Rejection at Nazareth: Luke 4: 14-30," *Scripture*, XX (1968), 5-9.

Price, James L., Jr. "The Gospel According to Luke," *Interpretation*, VII (1953), 195-212.

———. *Interpreting the New Testament*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Redlich, E. Basil. *The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels*. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1936.

Rehkopf, F. *Die Lukanische Sonderquelle*. *Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*. ("Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament," 5.) Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959.

Reicke, Bo. *The Gospel of Luke*. Translated by R. Mackenzie. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964.

———. "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *Studia Evangelica* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, 73). Edited by Kurt Aland *et al*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 206-216.

Rengstorf, Karl H. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 5. Neubearbeitete Auflage. ("Das Neue Testament Deutsch," Teilband 3.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.

Robertson, A. T. *Luke the Historian in Light of Research*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.

———. "Luke's Method of Research," *Biblical Review*, V (1920), 171-195.

Robinson, William C., Jr. "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative (9:51ff)," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIX (1960), 20-31.

———. *The Way of the Lord: A Study of History and Eschatology in the Gospel of Luke*. A Basel University dissertation, 1960. Published privately, 1962.

Rohde, Joachim. "Formgeschichte und Redactionsgeschichte in der neutestamentlichen Forschung der Gegenwart," *Theologische Literatur Zeitschrift*, XC (1965), 226-228.

________. *Die redaktionsgeschichtliche Methode: Einfürhrung und Sichtung des Forschungstandes*. Berlin: Furche-Verlag, 1966.

Rowlingson, Donald T. *Introduction to New Testament Study*. New York: Macmillan, 1956.

Ruckstrehl, Eugene. *Chronology of the Last Days of Jesus*. Translated by Victor J. Drapela. New York: Desclee Company, 1965.

Rushbrooke, W. G. *Synopticon: An Exposition of the Common Matter of the Synoptic Gospels*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1880.

Sahlin, Harald. *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur Protolukanischen Theologie*. ("Acta Seminarii Neotestamentier Upsaliensis," XII.) Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1945.

________. *Studien zum Dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums*. ("Uppsala University Arsskrift," 1949:2). Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1949.

Salazer, Abdon M. "Questions about St. Luke's Sources," *Novum Testamentum*, II (1958), 316-317.

Sanday, William. *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1872.

________, editor. *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911.

Schiwy, Günther. *Weg ins Neue Testament*. ("Kommentar und Material," 1.) Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1965.

Schlatter, Adolf. *Die Evangelium nach Markus und Lukas*. ("Erlaüterungen zum Neuen Testament," 2.) Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1954.

Schmid, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 4. Auflage. ("Regensburger Neues Testament.") Regensburg: Friedrich Pestet Verlag, 1960.

________. "Les recits de la resurrection de l'evangile de Luc," *Revue des Sciences religieuses*, XXV (1951), 119-137, 219-235.

Schmidt, K. L. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*. Berlin: Trowitzsch und Sohn, 1919.

Schneider, J. "Zur Analyse des lukanischen Reiseberichts," *Synoptische Studien für A. Wikenheuser*. München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1953, pp. 207-229.

Schubert, Paul. "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVII (1968), 1-16.

________. "The Structure and Significance of Luke xxiv," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*. (*Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Beihefte 21.) Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954.

________. "The Synoptic Gospels and Eschatology," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XIV (1946), 151-157.

Schürmann, Heinz. *Der Abendmahlsbericht Lukas 22, 7-38*. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1960.

________. "Protolukanische Spracheigentumlichkeiten? Zu Fr. Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle. Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*," *Biblescheft Zertschrift*, V (1961), 266-286.

________. *Einer Quellenkritischen Untersuchung des Lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes*, Lk 22, 7-38. I. Teil. *Der Paschamahlbericht, Lk 22*, (7-14.) 15-18, *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XIX (1953), 1-123; II. *Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22, 19-20, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XX (1955), 1-153; III. *Jesu Abschiedsrede, Lk 22, 21-38. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XX (1957), 1-160.

Schweizer, Edward. "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, VI (1950), 161-185.

________. "Spirit of God," *Bible Key Words*. Translated by A. E. Harvey. (From G. Kittel, editor, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*.) New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960, III, 1-119.

________. "The Spirit of Power: The Uniformity and Diversity of the Concept of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament" (translated by John Bright and Eugene Debor), *Interpretation*, VI (1952), 259-278.

Scott, Ernest F. *The Literature of the New Testament*. ("Records of Civilization Sources and Studies," XV.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

Songer, Harold H. "Luke's Portrayal of the Origins of Jesus," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (1967), 453-464.

Sparks, H. F. D. "St. Luke's Transpositions," *New Testament Studies*, III (1956-1957), 219-223.

Stagg, Frank. "The Journey Toward Jerusalem in Luke's Gospel," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (1967), 499-512.

Stanton, Vincent H. *The Gospels as Historical Documents*. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1903 (I), 1900 (II), 1920 (III).

Stather-Hunt, B. P. W. *Primitive Gospel Sources*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.

Stephenson, T. "The Classification of Doublets in the Synoptic Gospels," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXX (1918), 1-8.

Stöger, Alois. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 2 Teile. ("Geistliche Schriftlesung," 31, 32.) Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963, 1966.

Stonehouse, N. B. *Origins of the Synoptic Gospels. Some Basic Questions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.

________. *The Witness of Luke to Christ*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.

Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo*. Edited and translated by Horace L. Jones. 8 vols. ("The Loeb Classical Library.") London: William Heinemann, 1930.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1924.

________. "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problems," *Hibbert Journal*, XX (1920), 103-111.

________. "Die Ur-Lukas Hypothese," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 102 (1930), 332-340.

Stuhlmueller, Carroll. *The Gospel of St. Luke*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1960.

Suyama, Yoshio. "The Eschatology of the Evangelist Luke." Unpublished M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1965.

Talbert, Charles. "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," *New Testament Studies*, XIV (1968), 259-271.

________. "The Lukan Presentation of Jesus' Ministry in Galilee," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (1967), 485-497.

________. *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lucan Purpose*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Tannehill, R. "A Study in the Theology of Luke-Acts," *Anglican Theological Review*, XLIII (1961), 195-204.

Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke i-ii and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," *New Testament Studies*, XIII(1967), 184-195.

Taylor, Vincent. "After Fifty Years: I. The Gospel and the Gospels," *Expository Times*, L (1938-1939), 8-12.

________. *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.

________. "The First Draft of Luke's Gospel," *Theology*, XIV (1927), 131-164.

________. *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study in New Testament Theology*. London: Macmillan, 1948.

________. *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*. London: Macmillan, 1933.

________. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1959.

________. "Important Hypothesis Reconsidered -- the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Expository Times*, LXVII (1955-1956), 12-16.

________. "Is the Proto-Luke Hypothesis Sound?," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXVIII (1927-1928), 147-155.

________. "Methods of Gospel Criticism," *Expository Times*, LXXI (1959-1960), 68-72.

________. "The Narrative of the Crucifixion," *New Testament Studies*, VIII (1962), 333-334.

________. "The Order of Q," *Journal of Theological Studies*, IV (1953), 27-31.

________. "The Original Order of Q," *New Testament Essays in Memory of T. W. Manson*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp. 246-269.

________. "The Passion Sayings," *Expository Times*, LIV (1942-1943), 249-250.

———. *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*. London: Macmillan, 1958.

———. "Professor J. M. Creed and the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1934-1935), 236-238.

———. "Proto-Luke," *Expository Times*, XXXIII (1921-1922), 250-252.

———. "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Expository Times*, LXVII (1955-1956), 12-16.

———. "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis: A Rejoinder," *Expository Times*, LIV (1942-1943), 219-222.

———. "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis: A Reply to Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke's Queries," *Theology: A Journal of Historic Christianity*, XIV (1927), 72-76.

———. "Rehkopf's List of Words and Phrases Illustrative of Pre-Lukan Speech Usage," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XV (1964), 59-62.

———. "Second Thoughts--VI. Formgeschichte," *Expository Times*, LXXV (1964), 356-358.

———. "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems. I. The Elusive Q," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1934), 68-74.

———. "The Synoptic Gospels and Some Recent British Criticism," *Journal of Religion*, VIII (1928), 225-246.

———. "Theologians of our Time VII: Friedrich Rehkopf," *Expository Times*, LXXIV (1962), 262-266.

———. "Theologians of our Time: H. Schürmann," *Expository Times*, LXXIV (1962), 77-81.

———. "The Value of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Expository Times*, XXXVI (1924-1925), 476-477.

Temple, Sidney. "Two Traditions of the Last Supper, Betrayal, and Arrest," *New Testament Studies*, VII (1960-1961), 77-85.

Tenny, Merrill Chaplin. *New Testament Survey*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.

Tinsley, E. J. *The Gospel According to Luke*. ("The Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible.") Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

Tittle, Ernest Fremont. *The Gospel According to Luke: Exposition and Application.* New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Tolbert, Malcolm. "Leading Ideas of the Gospel of Luke," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (1967), 441-452.

Torrey, Charles C. *Our Translated Gospels.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1936.

Turner, Nigel. "The Relation of Luke i and ii to Hebrew Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," *New Testament Studies*, II (1955), 100-109.

Voss, Gerhard. *Die Christologie der Lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen.* ("Studia Neotestamentica.") Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965.

Weiser, Thomas. "Kingdom and Church in Luke-Acts." Unpublished Th. D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1962.

Weiss, Bernard. *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums.* Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlungung, 1907.

Wickes, Dean Rockwell. *The Sources of Luke's Perean Section.* ("Historical and Linguistic Studies." Second series, II.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1912.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. *New Testament Introduction.* Translated by Joseph Cunningham. Freiburg: Herder, 1958.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form-und Traditions-geschichte Untersuchungen.* ("Wissenschaftliche Monographen zum Alten und Neuen Testament," 5.). Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961.

Wilcox, Max. *Semitisms in Acts.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Williams, C. S. C. "Commentaries and Books on St. Luke's Gospel," *Theology: A Journal of Historic Christianity*, LXII (1959), 408-414.

———. "Luke-Acts in Recent Study," *Expository Times*, LXXIII (1961-1962), 133-136.

Wilson, R. M. "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narratives," *Studia Evangelica* ("*Text und Untersuchungen*," 73.) Edited by Kurt Aland *et al.* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 235-253.

Wilson, William R. "The Trial of Jesus: A Judicial, Literary and Historical Study." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1960.

Winter, Paul. "Lucan Sources," *Expository Times*, LXVII (1959-1960), 285.

________. "Luke xxii, 66b-71," *Studia Theologica*, IX (1955), 112-115.

________. "On Luke and Lucan Sources," *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLVII (1956), 217-242.

________. "Sources of the Lucan Passion Narrative," *Expository Times*, LXVIII (1956-1957), 95.

________. "The Treatment of his Sources by the Third Evangelist in Lk. xxi-xxiv," *Studia Theologica*, VIII (1954), 138-172.

________. *The Trial of Jesus*. ("Studia Judaica:Forschungen zum Wissenschaft des Judentums," Bd. 1.) Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1961.

________. "Two Notes on Luke I, II, with Regard to the Theory of 'Imitation Hebraisms,'" *Studia Theologica*, VII (1953), 158-165.

Woods, F. H. "The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels," *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastic, Essays Chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism by Members of the University of Oxford*. *II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890, pp. 59-104.

Wrede, William. *The Origin of the New Testament*. Translated by James S. Hill ("Harper's Library of Living Thought.") London: Harper and Brothers, 1909.

Young, Franklin W. "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-examination," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVIII (1949), 285-299.

BIOGRAPHY

Allen Freeman Page was born May 21, 1939, in Durham County, North Carolina, the fifth of six sons of Hubert Leroy and Gladys Louise (Blaylock) Page. He received his elementary and high school education in the Durham County School System. After two years at Mars Hill College, he attended Wake Forest College where he received the B. A. degree in June, 1961. On June 10, 1961, he married Sally Adair Rigsbee. He attended Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary during the academic year 1961-1962, after which he transferred to Union Theological Seminary in New York City where he received the B. D. degree in May, 1964.

In September, 1964, he entered the graduate program in religion at Duke University. He received University Scholarships in the years 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967. Since September, 1964, he has also been a teaching assistant in Hellenistic Greek in The Divinity School. He has been appointed as an instructor in The Divinity School in conjunction with the Duke University Department of Religion for the academic year 1968-1969.